

THE Catholic Mind

VOL. LII

APRIL, 1954

NO. 1096

Education and Christian Culture

CHRISTOPHER DAWSON

*Reprinted from COMMONWEAL**

FATHER LEO R. WARD'S article in the *Commonweal* of September 25, 1953, "Is There a Christian Learning?" draws attention to a problem of which I have been increasingly conscious during recent years. At first sight it may seem surprising that there is any need for the discussion of such a problem, at least among Catholic educationalists, for one would have expected that the whole question would have been threshed out years ago and there was no longer room for any difference of opinion. But as a matter of fact this is far from being the case, and the more one looks into the subject, the more one is struck by the vagueness and uncertainty of educated opinion in

Mr. Dawson scarcely needs an introduction to our readers. One of the great scholars and thinkers of our day, he is the author of PROGRESS AND RELIGION, THE MAKING OF EUROPE and of other famous works.

this matter and the lack of any accepted doctrine or educational policy.

No doubt the situation in all the English-speaking countries differs essentially from that of Catholic Europe where the Church has either preserved a privileged position in educational matters or, more frequently, has been forced to resist the hostile pressure

* 386 Fourth Ave., New York 16, N. Y., Dec. 4, 1953

of an anti-clerical or "laicist" regime. The Catholics of the English-speaking countries, in England as well as in America and in Australasia, have not had to face the continental type of political anti-clericalism, but on the other hand, they have had no privileged position and no established educational institutions of their own. They have had to rebuild their whole educational system from the bottom upwards with their own scanty resources. And so the main problem of Catholic education in the English-speaking countries has been the problem of the primary school—how to secure the necessary minimum of religious instruction for their children.

The urgency of this issue has relegated all the problems of higher education to the second place. We have felt that if we can save the schools, the universities can look after themselves. And in fact they have done so, up to a point. Catholics have managed to adapt themselves fairly successfully to the English and American systems of higher education. Nevertheless it has been a question of adaptation to an external system and we have had little opportunity to decide what the nature of higher education should be or to create our own curriculum of studies.

All this is comparatively simple. But it is much more difficult to explain the situation in the past, when the Church dominated the whole educational system—schools, colleges and

universities—and determined the whole course of higher studies. Surely one would have expected that the study of Christian culture would have formed the basis of the higher studies and that the foundations of an educational tradition would have been laid which would have dominated Christian education ever since. But what actually happened was that for centuries higher education had been so identified with the study of one particular historic culture—that of ancient Greece and Rome—that there was no room left for anything else. Even the study of our own particular national culture, including both history and literature, did not obtain full recognition until the 19th century, while the concept of Christian culture as an object of study has never been recognized at all.

CULTURAL VACUUM

The great obstacle to this study has not been religious or secularist prejudices but strictly cultural. It has its origins in the idealization of classical antiquity by the humanist scholars and artists who rediscovered the beauty of nature. And it followed from this conception that the period that intervened between the fall of Rome and the Renaissance offered the historian, as Voltaire says, "the barren prospect of a thousand years of stupidity and barbarism." They were "middle ages" in the original sense of the word—that is, a kind of

cultural vacuum between two ages of cultural achievement which (to continue the same quotation) "vindicate the greatness of the human spirit."

This view, which necessarily ignores the achievements and even the existence of Christian culture, was passed on almost unchanged from the Renaissance to the 18th-century Enlightenment and from the latter to the modern secularist ideologies. And though today every instructed person recognizes that it is based on a completely erroneous view of history and very largely on a sheer ignorance of history, it still continues to exert an immense influence, both consciously and unconsciously, on modern education and on our attitude to the past.

It is therefore necessary for educators to make a positive effort to exorcise the ghost of this ancient error and to give the study of Christian culture the place that it deserves in modern education. We cannot leave this to the medievalists alone, for they are to some extent themselves tied to the error by the limitation of their specialism. For Christian culture is not the same thing as medieval culture. It existed before the Middle Ages began and it continued to exist after they had ended. We cannot understand medieval culture unless we study its foundations in the age of

the Fathers and the Christian Empire, and we cannot understand the classical vernacular literatures of post-Renaissance Europe unless we study their roots in medieval culture. Even the Renaissance itself, as Conrad Burdach and E. R. Curtius have shown, is not intelligible unless it is studied as part of a movement which had its origins deep in the Middle Ages.

NEW APPROACH

Now it seems to me that the time is ripe for a new approach to the subject, since our whole educational system—and not in one country alone, but throughout the Western world—is passing through a period of rapid and fundamental change. The old domination of classical humanism has passed away, and nothing has taken its place except the scientific specialisms which do not provide a complete intellectual education, but rather tend to disintegrate into technologies. Every educator recognizes that this is unsatisfactory. A scientific specialist or a technologist who has nothing but his specialism is not an educated person. He tends to become merely an instrument of the industrialist or the bureaucrat, a worker ant in an insect society, and the same is true of the literary specialist, though his social function is less obvious.

But even the totalitarians do not accept this solution; on the contrary, they insist most strongly on the importance of the cultural element in education whether their ideal of culture is nationalist and racial as with the Nazis, or cosmopolitan and proletarian as with the Communists. No doubt from our point of view this totalitarian culture means the forcible indoctrination of scientist and worker alike with the same narrow party ideology, but at least it does provide a simple remedy for the disintegrating effects of modern specialization and gives the whole educational system a unifying purpose.

Heaven forbid that we should attempt to solve our educational problems in this way by imposing a compulsory political ideology on the teacher and the scientist. But we cannot avoid this evil by sitting back and allowing higher education to degenerate into a chaos of competing specialisms without any guidance for the student except the urgent practical necessity of finding a job and making a living as soon as his education is finished. This combination of utilitarianism and specialism is not only fatal to the idea of a liberal education, it is also one of the main causes of the intellectual disintegration of modern Western culture under the aggressive threat of totalitarian nationalism and Communism.

Some cultural education is necessary if Western culture is to survive,

and we can no longer rely exclusively on the traditional discipline of classical humanism, though this is the source of all that was best in the tradition of Western liberalism and Western science.

MISSING LINK

I believe that the study of Christian culture is the missing link which it is essential to supply if the tradition of Western education and Western culture is to survive, for it is only through this study that we can understand how Western culture came to exist and what are the essential values for which it stands.

And when I speak of Western culture, I am not using the word in the limited sense in which it was used by Matthew Arnold and the humanists, who were concerned only with the highest level of cultivated intelligence, but in the sense of the anthropologists and social historians, who have widened it out to cover the whole pattern of human life and thought in a living society. In this sense of the word, a culture is a definite historical unit, but as Dr. Toynbee explains so clearly in the Introduction to his *Study of History*, it has a much wider expansion in space and time than any purely political unit, and it alone constitutes an intelligible field of historical study since no part of it can be properly understood except in relation to the whole.

Now, behind the existing unity of

Western culture we have the older unity of Christian culture, which is the historic basis of our civilization. For more than a thousand years, from the conversion of the Roman Empire down to the Reformation, the peoples of Europe were fully conscious of their membership in the great Christian society and accepted the Christian Faith and the Christian moral law as the ultimate bond of social unity and the spiritual basis of their way of life. And even after the unity of Christendom had been broken by the Reformation, the tradition of Christian culture still survived in the culture and institutions of the different European peoples, and in some cases exists even in the midst of our secularized culture, as we have seen in the English coronation rite during this very year.

Consequently anyone who wishes to understand our own culture as it exists today cannot dispense with the study of Christian culture, whether he is a Christian or not. Indeed in some ways this study is more necessary for the secularist than for the Christian because he lacks that ideological key to the understanding of the past which every Christian ought to possess.

I do not deny that there are great practical obstacles in the way of this study. The secularist is naturally afraid that it might be used as an instrument of religious propaganda and he is consequently anxious to

minimize the importance of the Christian element in our culture and to exaggerate the gulf between modern civilization and the Christian culture of the past.

The Christian, on the other hand, is often afraid lest the historical study of Christian culture should lead to an identification of Christianity with a culture and a social system which belong to the dead past. But for the Christian the past can never be dead, as it often seems to the secularist, since we believe that past and present are united in the one Body of the Church and that the Christians of the past are still present as witnesses and helpers in the life of the Church today.

No doubt it would be an error to apply this principle to the particular forms of Christian culture which are conditioned by material factors and limited by the change of historical circumstances. But as there is an organic relation between the Christian faith and the Christian life, so also there is a relation between Christian life and Christian culture. The relation between faith and life is completely realized only in the life of the saints. But there has never been a temporal society of saints, and the attempt to create one, as in Puritan England or Massachusetts, represents a sectarian perversion of Christian culture. Nevertheless it is the very nature of the Christian Faith and the Christian life to penetrate and change

the social environment in which they exist, and there is no aspect of human life which is closed to this leavening and transforming process. Thus Christian culture is the periphery of the circle which has its center in the Incarnation and the faith of the Church and the lives of the saints.

TWO NEW CULTURES

All this is to be seen in history. Christianity did actually come into the historical world and did actually transform the societies with which it came into contact: first, the Hellenistic-Oriental society of the Eastern Roman Empire, and secondly, the Latin and barbarian societies of Western Europe. From this two new cultures were born—the Byzantine culture of the East and Western Christendom, both of which, in spite of their ultimate separation, share a large number of common characteristics.

Both of these cultures have now been secularized, but the process of secularization is so recent and even incomplete that it is absolutely impossible to understand them in their secularized form unless we have studied their Christian past.

Unfortunately it is nobody's business to study or to teach this subject and it is extremely difficult under existing conditions for anyone to acquire the necessary knowledge, even if he can spare the time and energy to do so. Nevertheless the very rea-

sons which make the study of the subject so difficult are also reasons in its favor from the educational point of view. They are due to the fact that it is an integrative subject which involves the cooperation of a number of different specialized studies, in the same way as the study of *litterae humaniores* in the Greats School at Oxford involves the cooperation of philosophers and historians as well as philologists and literary critics.

How then could such a study be instituted? It involves, like Classical Greats at Oxford, a cooperative study of Christian philosophy, Christian literature and Christian history. To do this we require at least a study of medieval Latin and a language other than our own—preferably French—as well as a study of English. Above all, it is necessary to study the three main phases of the Christian Culture: 1) its origins in the age of the Fathers and in the Christian Empire; 2) its development in the so-called Middle Ages when Christian Culture achieved classical form in the philosophy of St. Thomas and St. Bonaventure, the poetry of Dante and the art of the Gothic cathedral, and 3) its flowering in the vernacular cultures and literatures down to the 17th century.

This no doubt seems an ambitious program, but it is strictly analogous to the old humanist study which embraced the whole of classical culture in its three phases, as represented by the Homeric Age, the classical age

of Attic culture and the Latin culture of the Augustan and post-Augustan periods.

Nor is it so ambitious as some of the introductory general courses in the history of civilization in general which are actually being introduced at some of the American universities and which, I understand, have proved quite workable in practice. The essential thing is not to attempt to cram students with a complete knowledge of the history of Christian culture, but to introduce them to the subject, so that they will at least realize the existence of the whole, before they are irretrievably committed to a specialized study of the part or of a particle of the part.

CHRISTIAN INITIATIVE NEEDED

Today there is such a growing realization among educators of the dangers of utilitarian specialization and the need for the preservation of some integrative humanizing element in education that I think we may expect to find a good deal of encouragement and support for an experiment of this kind from many different quarters. But the initiative must come from the Christian side, for we can hardly expect government departments or secular universities to introduce such a study on their own account.

It is therefore essential that Christians should realize the importance of the issue and take the lead. Unfortunately Christian opinion is as yet

neither clear nor united. I am not thinking of the differences between Catholics and Protestants, which are often fundamental, but even among Catholics there is at present great uncertainty and difference of opinion when we come to these cultural questions. Everywhere since the Renaissance and the Reformation, and still more since the Revolution, Catholics have tended to adopt a purely defensive attitude, to live, as has been said, in a state of siege—and to confine themselves to the essential tasks of maintaining the Faith and preserving the standard of religious practice in matters essential to the very existence of the Church.

In this way Christian higher studies become more and more identified with ecclesiastical studies, which are regarded as the affair of the clergy, and the higher education of the laity becomes increasingly a secular education.

This is understandable and justifiable in the circumstances, so long as it is not regarded as an ideal state of things. But if it is carried too far, it is fatal to the cause which it seeks to defend. If you cut down to the bone of religious faith and leave people with nothing else but the bare right of practising their religion in a completely alien culture, you are left with nothing but the fleshless skeleton of Catholicism. The Ghetto Catholicism of the 19th-century Irish immigration in the factory towns of England and

the United States was a remarkable witness to the spiritual vitality of the Faith, but this witness was paid for by an immense leakage of those who were unable to withstand the pressure of their cultural environment and by the narrowness of the type of Catholicism which survived.

JEWISH CULTURE

It may be said that this was simply a return to the conditions of the early Church and that the Christianity of the catacombs, which was the seed of the new Christian culture, was precisely the same sociological phenomenon. But we forget that the early Christians had behind them one of the strongest purely religious cultures that has ever existed—I mean that of the Jews. In the eyes of the educated Greek or Roman, the early Christians no doubt seemed to be people of low culture who were cutting themselves off from the intellectual and social life of their age to follow queer oriental superstitions. In actual fact, however, the Gentile convert found not only a new faith and a new spiritual community, but also a new culture, which was far richer from the religious point of view than that which he had left. He was introduced into a new world and became the partaker in a literature and a social tradition which reached back to the beginnings of history.

Now the position of the modern Catholic resembles that of the primi-

tive Christian in so far as he also is the heir of the great tradition of sacred culture which has been lost by our modern secularized civilization. If he is deprived of this inheritance and forced to live by sheer faith, naked in an alien culture, his spiritual merit may be all the higher, but his chance of social survival is much smaller and his opportunities to influence the society of his age much more restricted. In that case his situation is not the same as that of the early Christian, but rather resembles that of the barbarian converts to Christianity who had received the Faith but as yet possessed no tradition of Christian life and thought and institutions. This was what actually happened in the slums of 19th-century England and America where the social foundations of our modern Catholicism were laid. It was in fact practically a culture-less Catholicism, a society of Christian barbarians.

But that is only one side of the picture. On the other hand, we have the converts, like Newman above all, who brought with them a rich heritage of Christian culture which they had salvaged from a society in process of secularization. It is this dualism and unevenness in the development of the modern English-speaking Catholics (for it is no less characteristic of America than of England) which are the source of our existing problems and opportunities. At the same time we have been faced with

the task of the internal restoration of Catholic culture and cultural re-education of the Catholic masses, as well as with the still greater task of meeting the external challenge of secular society and reclaiming Western culture for Christ. And the revival of Catholic higher education and the study of Christian culture are of equal importance for the achievement of both these objectives.

NO GROUND FOR PESSIMISM

It is easy to take a pessimistic view and to say that we have neither the material nor the economic resources for such vast undertakings, but when we look back 120 years and see what has been accomplished both in England and in America, we shall see that there is no real ground for pessimism. A new world of Catholicism has been created out of almost nothing. The achievement is greatest in the United States and it is in America that there seems the best prospect for the development of a Catholic culture, owing to greater material resources and to the existence of Catholic universities. On the other hand, English Catholicism has contributed more in proportion to its size in this particular field and it has, I think, achieved a greater degree of contact and penetration into the Protestant and secularist culture.

So I believe that there is a need for cooperation between our two communities and each of us has a great deal

to contribute towards this common end. We are both faced with a situation which differs essentially from that of the other European and the other American Catholic communities. We are both minorities in a predominantly Protestant society. We have to encounter secularism, indifference and sectarianism, but we are, on the whole, almost completely immune from that ferocious internecine conflict which divides the continental and Latin American Catholic from his anti-clerical opponent and which is usually reflected in a political division. Under these conditions, however, there is the risk that it may become too easy for us to accept the standards of our secularized culture and to become assimilated by it. It is therefore all the more important that we should react consciously against it by doing what is in our power to maintain and cultivate the tradition of Christian culture.

The obstacles to this are mainly practical ones—questions of the educational curriculum, of providing facilities for teaching and making the subject sufficiently popular to attract the Catholic student. The actual spade work of providing the materials of study and subjecting them to scientific criticism has already been done for us by the labors of generations of continental scholars. We have only to look at the great series of French Catholic encyclopedias—*The Dictionary of Theology*, *The Diction-*

ary of *Christian Archaeology and Liturgy*, *The Dictionary of Ecclesiastical History and Geography*, and, more recently, *The Dictionary of Spirituality and Mysticism*—to see how enormous our resources are. It is really a question of popularization, for there is a very wide gulf between this specialized tradition of Catholic scholarship and the culture of the educated layman.

It is this gap between Catholic scholarship and Catholic lay culture which has been largely responsible in the past for the secularization of our culture. There have never been greater scholars than the Catholics of the 17th century—men like Dugange and Petavius and Tillemont and Mabillon—but they found no Catholics to use their work for educational purposes. The men who utilized their labors and formed the opinion of educated society were their spiritual enemies—men like Bayle and Le Clerc, and Voltaire and Gibbon, who were the most powerful agents in the secularization and perversion of Western culture.

DANGER OF NOT USING CATHOLIC SCHOLARSHIP

Today the danger is not that Catholic scholarship will be misused this way but that it will not be used at all. As in the 16th century, a break has occurred in the continuity of Western culture, but this time it is of a far more fundamental character and af-

flicts everyone, whether he be Catholic or Protestant, Christian or Secularist.

We are passing through a technological revolution which is sweeping away the traditional ways of life and thought and creating a new social mechanism. But while this new order involves an immense increase in the scale and volume of mechanized mass communication, it also makes it much more difficult to maintain the old cultural standards and to preserve the continuity of Western culture. From the secularist point of view this is often regarded as a positive advantage, since for the first time in history it makes it possible to organize the thought and behavior of the masses in new patterns by deliberate social planning and control. But to the Christian the prospect of delivering the soul of the masses to the tender mercies of the planners and the politicians is intolerable, and in the same way any complete break with the past must be rejected since it endangers the continuity of the Christian tradition.

Consequently the more we can realize our spiritual and historical identity by the study of Christian culture, the better we shall be able to withstand the forces of secularization. For behind all the temporal vicissitudes of Christian history and the changing fortunes of Christendom there stands the reality of the one great society which is the hope of humanity and

which Saint Peter defined in a memorable sentence as "a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a special people . . . who in past times were not a people but are now the people of God." All through the ages

we see the creative process of sifting and regeneration and re-education out of which a new humanity is being formed; and the history of this process is the only history that really counts for the Christian.



Employers' Examination of Conscience

On October 6, 1953, Guy Farmer, Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, speaking before the Union Employers Section of the Printing Industry of America, formulated the following examination of conscience for employers:

"1. Have I truly accepted the presence of union organization among my employees?

2. Have I truly accepted the principle and practice of collective bargaining?

3. Have I always attempted to meet the union half way and worked out acceptable and fair compromises?

4. Have I paid enough attention to labor relations, and have I, within my own organization, picked the right men and set up the right organization for handling labor relations?

5. Have I educated my foremen in labor relations, have I kept them informed, and have I given them sufficient responsibility and authority?

6. Do I have the right kind of grievance procedures to provide for orderly and speedy disposition of grievances and complaints?

7. Have I worked out and clarified with the union our respective areas of responsibility?

8. Have I kept pace, within sound economic limits, with my industry and locality in wages and employee benefits?

9. Do I provide a safe, clean, healthy place for my employees to work?"

"If you can answer these in the affirmative," continued Mr. Farmer, "then you can be safe in assuming that your labor relations are on a sound footing and have a better than fair chance to succeed."

Future of the Liturgy

THE REV. H. A. REINHOLD

*Reprinted from THE PRIEST**

WE WERE only four American priests at the Liturgical Conference last fall at Lugano: Fr. Michael Mathis, C.S.C., of Notre Dame University; the Abbot and Fr. Godfrey Diekman, O.S.B., of St. John's University, Collegeville, Minnesota; and myself. Since neither Australia, nor Canada, nor South America was represented, and since there was only one Spanish priest, now studying in Germany, the United States did not appear to be worse off than the majority of nations. But when you compared our number and especially our "hierarchical value" with the members present, it became evident that as a national unit we were not represented as we should have been. Let me show what I mean.

Our host was little Switzerland: she had sent two bishops and a dozen priests, scholars and pastors. France was represented by the chairman of the French liturgical commission of the Bishops; the Archbishop of Rouen, two bishops, the complete Center of "Pastoral Liturgy" in Paris, and a dozen and more priests who are either scholars or engaged in parish work. Holland, Belgium and Austria

provided a bishop and scholars each. Germany had sent the Cardinal presiding over the Bishops' Meetings, the Chairman of the Liturgical Commission, Bishop Stohr of Mayence, and a number of bishops, scholars, pastors, and the members of two bodies engaged in pastoral liturgical studies. Not only was the Bishop of Berlin there, but besides him several priests from deep in the Iron Curtain country thought it worth while risking all to attend.

Rome had sent Cardinal Ottaviani and the director of the historical section, generally credited with the shaping of the Easter Vigil, Fr. Ferdinando Antonelli, O.F.M., who was present at every single meeting and discussion. Cardinal Lercaro, Archbishop of Bologna, gave one of the key papers, asking in very plain words for the introduction of the people's language into those parts of the liturgy that are read or sung for the people. Besides the Cardinal, Italy was represented by several bishops, among others the president of the Bishops' liturgical commission, who also presided at our discussions.

Here the reader will ask: Why this

* Huntington, Ind., December, 1953

buildup of personalities? What is this going to prove? Plenty! If the Cardinal who is the head of the Holy Office not only comes to these meetings but stands out at all functions as the most eager participant, singing with the congregation; if the head of the German hierarchy not only sings the Communion Mass (sic!) for the priests, but does so at an altar facing the congregation in a modern church, and if he conforms to all this with visible enthusiasm; if one of the most prominent members of the Sacred College of Cardinals comes out, not just for a partial translation of the *Rituale*, but for a form of the Mass itself which removes the language barrier and really makes popular participation possible; if all this and more happens at a meeting approved and blessed by the Holy Father, endorsed by Cardinal Micara, the head of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, welcomed by Monsignor Montini, and if it causes wonderment and surprise, then the wondering and surprised are the ones who should ask themselves: have I really taken sufficient interest and have I been provident and bold enough in facing the problems of our day?

A great deal of what went on in Lugano is "classified" information. I am not allowed to quote any of the speakers, nor report any resolutions. The reason for this is that it is the wish of the Holy See to hear the de-

sires of the scholars and pastors, but not to have its decisions prejudiced by votes, great names or bolder innovations.

The meeting, after clearance with the Holy See, was called by the Pastoral Liturgical Study Centers of France, Germany, Italy, Holland, Belgium and Switzerland. The first part, more classified even than the other, lasted from September 12 to 14 and was attended by only twenty scholars. All I may say about it is that we had such first-class men as Abbot Capelle, Fr. J. A. Jungmann, Frs. Roquet, O.P. and Gy, O.P., and that it carried on where the preceding small conferences of Maria Laach (1951) and Mt. Ste. Odile (1952) had left off.

LITURGY OF THE MASS

Its subject was the coming reform of the liturgy of the Mass. Its aim was to find ways of making the Mass really a people's liturgy and of cutting off medieval excrescences that obscure its clear outlines to such a degree that even those who have done all to help their congregations participate as they should have now arrived at a point where it is no longer the fault of the priest or the people but the rite itself that no further progress can be made.

Without being able to quote, I may say that a person who counts is reported to have said: "We have done all we can to bring the people to full-

est participation in the Mass. The priests and the people—in Europe—can do no more. Now it is time to give the Mass such shape that it becomes more available to the people.”

When that reform, together with a three- or four-year course of gospels and epistles covering the *whole* New Testament, is finally carried out, those priests who have done little or nothing in this field can merrily skip a whole stage of the effort required by Pius X and Pius XII and easily enter into a harvest on which others have labored a whole generation long.

THE HOLY WEEK REFORM

On Monday, September 14, the open sessions, attended by bishops, 120 priests and a considerable number of laymen, began. Their topics were the continuation of the reform of Holy Week: Palm Sunday, Holy Thursday and Good Friday (by the way; the *desiderata* concerning Holy Thursday with a view of pastoral problems came from America). Not on principle but for practical reasons the procedure of a Synod was adopted, so that most priests, clad in albs and stoles provided uniformly by the great Swiss vestment studio of Sister Augusta Flueler, sang the Mass with the Cardinal or Bishop and received Holy Communion from his hand.

Since a number of priests preferred to say a private Mass, both ways of dealing with the problem

were left open. It is obvious that a great spirit of brotherliness prevailed among the participants. One Mass was sung in the Rite of Milan, which is quite different from our Roman Mass, but yet so similar that we all were able to take an active part. In all these liturgical functions it was clear that Latin should never entirely be discarded but should remain the “*lingua communis*” of our liturgy.

Some delegates who knew but one language or two were distressed by the fact that so much escaped them. But all this did not affect the conviction of the majority, nearly of the unanimity, of delegates that in parishes and in parish worship the greatest barrier to popular participation is the language and the rites of the catechumen Mass (which in its present form is the one thing no catechumen understands!).

REPORTS ON THE EASTER VIGIL

The discussions on the future reforms of Holy Week were preceded by reports on the Easter Vigil in the different countries and, since this was handled with an eye on previous discussion in periodicals, I am at liberty to say a little more: the closer the country to danger, the more alert and tried its faith, the greater its success, especially among the heroic Christians behind the Iron Curtain. After sloughing off those who come out of curiosity the first time, experience still shows that people in

enormous numbers now see and hear and participate in this greatest rite of all, compared with the handful of old ladies that used to sit through it on Saturday morning. But one thing also became clear: you can't simply decree that as of 1954 all parishes must have the Easter Vigil. You have to train the clergy and especially the Lenten preacher. If you don't do it, the whole "show" will be a failure.

There is a growing number of dioceses which would prefer to have this liturgical rite of the "Resurrection" transferred to the hour of sunrise. Others wish to have permission to anticipate it in the evening (with the same old tendency of advancing the hours steadily until we are back where we were when we started). Europe with its many local traditions has here many real problems in the existing non-liturgical "resurrection rites," which are old and hard to assimilate. It seems that there is a general hope that Rome will settle for a choice with limits, setting eight p.m. on Saturdays as a *terminus a quo*, where there is a local tradition, and sunrise on Sunday as a *terminus ad quem*, leaving midnight as the preferred hour, as it is in the middle between the "light ceremonies" belonging to the hour of dusk and the Mass which is really not a "vigil" Mass in the general sense, but the resurrection Mass, and therefore easily associated with the hour of sunrise—even in the oldest tradition.

There seems to be great unanimity that the vigil is still too long for parishes of one priest and there seems to be a flood of mail asking for a shortening (and translation) of the "*Exsultet*" and the Blessing of the Font.

LITTLE DISCUSSION HERE

Before getting lost in details and giving away "classified" information, I want to say that much of this is being discussed in clergy periodicals in Europe and that in general European priests and bishops are astonished to see how "quiet" it seems to be in these United States. The lack of interest in one of the most significant reforms made by the Holy See is something nobody outside the Anglo-Saxon and Hispanic countries seems to understand. With Rome so acutely aware of the need for reform and so anxious to hear what "front-line" pastors have to say, it is most perturbing to encounter stony silence or to notice a complete lack of interest in a country which believes that it is as dynamic in its religion as it is in certain realms of technical progress and economic expansion.

There was noticeable a good balance of the need to maintain sound, historical tradition and of the need to give the people of this century a liturgy which they can perform before first adopting a medieval frame of mind—in a way, the old problem of St. Paul and the

Council of Jerusalem. No one who heard the gripping words of the Bishop of Berlin or the pleading of the Chinese missionary, Fr. Hofinger, S.J. (now in Boguio, P. I.) will ever feel that we can go on as we do. We must go forward and Rome is here far ahead of us in the United States.

But here is also my personal hope: many American priests who now shrink from the liturgical movement do so for a few reasons that will disappear after the reform, namely, that the liturgy needs reform, not only the people, and that all our past efforts in dialog Masses, offertory processions, sung Mass, altars facing the people, only led us a short distance and stopped us dead before we reached the vital point—living contact with the people, a meeting of God and the assembled Church in mutual recognition.

The very fact that our brethren in Europe voice their misgivings and that Rome listens with warm attention, that the Father hears the lamenting of his children, is one impression I wish to leave with our readers. What Europe expects is an echo where there has been a chilling silence. It is no longer the question of more perfect Masses: the question is, are we holding or losing our people? As long as a convert cannot grasp what happens at the altar without a "guide," we are not attracting him the way we should. This was a problem seen by millions: it became articulate at Lugano. The great relief Lugano causes is that Rome is not timid nor has it to be convinced: Rome, and this is the amazing discovery, does exactly what it demands in *Mediator Dei*. It develops liturgy for the "Laos"—the people.



Reform Through Marriage?

Don't marry to reform a person. This fault is verified in a girl who discovers in courtship certain serious faults in the man she intends to marry. The man may show a tendency towards heavy drinking. She may learn that he is a heavy gambler. Violent rages may crop out unexpectedly or strange moods may be manifest. The time to be practical about such failings is prior to marriage when it is still possible to back out of a situation that later may be the cause of untold suffering and misery. Many times we have heard from weeping unhappy women the admission that they were aware of these failings before marriage but "thought they could bring about a change after marriage." Such a reform seldom, if ever, takes place.—Msgr. Edward M. Burke, in the *VOICE OF ST. JUDE, Chicago, Ill., January, 1954.*

Church and State: An American Catholic Tradition

JOHN TRACY ELLIS

Professor of History

Catholic University of America

*Reprinted from John Carroll Society QUARTERLY**

FEW subjects have aroused more interest among thoughtful Americans in recent years than that of the relations in this country between Church and State. Unfortunately the issue has not always been temperately discussed—with the result that much ill feeling has been engendered among the various religious bodies in the United States. This bitterness has not only done a disservice to religion in general, but has also resulted in injury to the internal peace of the nation at a time when it was seriously threatened from outside its frontiers. One is reminded of the words of John Carroll, who in 1790 became the first Catholic bishop of the United States, when he reluctantly entered on a public controversy in defense of his religious faith while the Republic was still in its infancy.

Carroll deplored the necessity of replying to his antagonist lest he disturb the harmony then existing among men of differing religious beliefs,

which, he said, "if we have the wisdom and temper to preserve, America may come to exhibit a proof to the world that general and equal toleration, by giving a free circulation to fair argument, is the most effectual method to bring all denominations of Christians to a unity of faith."

In raising again the question of Church and State in this article, I wish to make it clear at the outset that I have neither the intention nor the professional competence to discuss the theological aspects of the problem. The doctrinal teaching of the Catholic Church on Church and State is accessible to all interested students of the subject. In the past two or three years American Catholic theologians have examined it in journals like the *American Ecclesiastical Review* and *Theological Studies*, where the divergent views of these theologians have been put forth in great detail. There the authoritative

* 5612 N. 23rd, Arlington, Va., Fall, 1953

pronouncements of modern pontiffs, such as the encyclicals *Immortale Dei* of November 1, 1885, and *Libertas praestantissimum* of June 20, 1888, of Pope Leo XIII, have been analyzed in their application to the United States, where the Constitution forbids anything like a union of Church and State and where, too, the policy of religious toleration of all men is a recognized principle embodied in the fundamental law of the land.

What I intend, rather, is to set down some little known and seldom recalled statements on this question by the leading Catholic bishops of the United States over a century and a half. For I am convinced that, reflecting as they do the thinking of the most important members of the hierarchy in this country from the earliest years of the Republic to our own day, they reveal an authentic tradition.

FATHER JOHN CARROLL

First, let us go back to Father John Carroll. On February 27, 1785, he wrote a letter to an English friend about constitutional power which had been granted the Maryland Legislature to levy a general tax for the support of the Christian religion. This provision disturbed many Marylanders who belonged to religious bodies other than the recently formed Protestant Episcopal Church, which in its colonial counterpart had been accorded a favored status by the govern-

ment. Father Carroll mentioned the misgivings which the provision had aroused among Presbyterians, Methodists and Quakers; said that the Catholics would join these Protestant groups in opposing it with might and main; and added: "We have all smarted heretofore under the lash of an established church, and shall therefore be on our guard against every approach towards it." And three months after the Constitutional Convention had finished its work on the Federal Constitution, Carroll made public his stand on religious toleration in the *Columbian Magazine* of December 1787:

Thanks to genuine spirit and Christianity, the United States have banished intolerance from their system of government, and many of them have done the justice to every denomination of Christians, which ought to be done to them all, of placing them on the same footing of citizenship, and conferring an equal right of participation in national privileges. Freedom and independence, acquired by the united efforts, and cemented with the mingled blood of Protestant and Catholic fellow citizens, should be equally enjoyed by all.

Thus did the founder of the American hierarchy accept wholeheartedly the separation of Church and State in the United States, with its accompanying principle of equal and universal religious toleration for men of all faiths.

Five years after the death of Archbishop Carroll there arrived in this

country from Ireland in December, 1820 the man who was destined to play a leading role in the development of American Catholicism during the next two decades. This was John England, first Bishop of Charleston, who assumed control of his vast Southern diocese at the age of thirty-four. He had been in the United States only a little over three years when he spoke his mind on the union of Church and State in no uncertain terms. In an address before the Hibernian Society of Savannah, Georgia, on March 17, 1824, the Bishop struck out at the British Government which at that time was trying to win the right of veto over the selection of Catholic bishops in Ireland.

BISHOP ENGLAND SPEAKS OUT

Praising the resistance of the Irish clergy to this attempted concession, the Bishop remarked: "May God long preserve the liberties of America from the union of any church with any state! In any country, with any religion, it is an unnatural increase of the power of the executive against the liberties of the people." And a year and a half after his Savannah speech he returned to the topic in a letter of September 17, 1825, to Daniel O'Connell, the Irish liberator:

I am convinced [wrote Bishop England] that a total separation from the temporal government is the most natural and safest state for the church in any place where it is not, as in the

Papal territory, a complete government of churchmen.

BISHOP HUGHES' POSITION

Meanwhile the Catholic Church in the United States had grown and expanded from an estimated 35,000 Catholics in 1790 to over 650,000 by 1840, two years before Bishop England died. By that time there had appeared on the American scene another Irish-born bishop who was to take the leading place left vacant by England and become the most prominent Catholic churchman of the mid-century: John Hughes, fourth Bishop of New York, and from 1850 to 1864 the first Archbishop of that fastest-growing of American sees. Hughes' episcopacy began in 1838 at a time when the fury of the Nativist agitation against foreigners and Catholics was at its height. In the bitter controversies of those days the efforts of Bishop Hughes to win once more State funds for the education of Catholic children in New York brought forth the charge that any renewal of financial assistance to the parochial schools would endanger the American principle of separation of Church and State. Hughes met the charge in a characteristically forthright manner, and said in a speech delivered at Washington Hall on June 1, 1841:

The whole matter now stands in this position. At the commencement the great alarm raised was that the admission of our claim would be a step to-

wards the union of Church and State. And if those who opposed us upon that ground were sincere in it, I respect them for their opposition; for there is nothing which every patriot should feel to be a more imperative duty than to resist to the uttermost any attempt to introduce measures tending to so disastrous a result.

That statement—and his reference, later on in the same speech, to the prevention of “the justly obnoxious union of Church and State”—made Bishop Hughes’ position clear. And he expressed it even more positively two and a half years later in an address before a large audience in the Broadway Tabernacle in New York:

I regard the constitution of the United States as a monument of wisdom, an instrument of liberty and right, unequaled—unrivaled—in the annals of the human race. Every separate provision of that immortal document is stamped with the features of wisdom; and yet among its wise provisions, what I regard as the *wisest* of all, is the brief, simple, but comprehensive declaration that “Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.”

The unhappy chapter of American history which was written by the strident anti-Catholicism of the Nativists and Know-Nothings during the eighteen-forties and fifties—and which has been so expertly described by the non-Catholic historian, Ray Allen Billington, in his volume *The Protestant Crusade*—found its denouement in the far more absorbing struggle which broke out over slavery and

sectional conflict. And it was not until the late eighteen-eighties that another organized movement against the Catholic Church in the United States appeared, when the American Protective Association—the APA—was brought into being by Henry F. Bowers and his associates in March, 1887. During the next ten years the country suffered the ignominy of a campaign of religious bigotry the like of which had not been seen since before the Civil War. Once more the accusation of disloyalty to the nation was heard, and again the leaders of the Catholic Church were taxed with the charge that they represented a dangerous minority who, if they ever attained a majority of the population, would abolish the separation of Church and State.

JAMES CARDINAL GIBBONS

In the same month that Bowers founded the APA the second American Catholic churchman to be honored with membership in the College of Cardinals received the insignia of his rank. This was James Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore. When as a newly created Cardinal he took possession in Rome of his titular church of Santa Maria in Trastevere, he paid a glowing tribute to the political institutions of his native country and reflected his complete satisfaction with the relations of Church and State in the United States:

For myself [said Gibbons], as a citi-

zen of the United States, without closing my eyes to our defects as a nation, I proclaim, with a deep sense of pride and gratitude, and in this great capital of Christendom, that I belong to a country where the civil government holds over us the aegis of protection without interfering in the legitimate exercise of our sublime mission as ministers of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

The sentiments which Cardinal Gibbons expressed at Rome in 1887 deepened with the passing years, and nearly a quarter of a century later, in a memorable article in the *North American Review* in 1909, he made his position even more emphatic. He wrote:

American Catholics rejoice in our separation of Church and State; and I can conceive of no combination of circumstances likely to arise which would make a union desirable either to Church or State. We know the blessings of our present arrangement; it gives us liberty and binds together priests and people in a union better than that of Church and State. Other countries, other manners; we do not believe our system adapted to all conditions; we leave it to Church and State in other lands to solve their problems for their own best interests. For ourselves, we thank God we live in America, "in this happy country of ours," to quote Mr. [Theodore] Roosevelt, where "religion and liberty are natural allies."

In the long period from 1887 to his death in 1921 Cardinal Gibbons was dean of the American hierarchy, and no Catholic bishop of the United States ever made more manifest his perfect contentment with the relations

of Church and State than he did. But in this attitude he had no monopoly, for among his contemporaries and friends were outstanding churchmen who shared entirely the Cardinal's point of view—such as, for example, John Lancaster Spalding, first Bishop of Peoria; John Ireland, first Archbishop of St. Paul; and John J. Keane, first Rector of the Catholic University of America and later Archbishop of Dubuque. Late in 1896 Bishop Keane went abroad to live for a time, and during his sojourn in Europe he found many strange notions among Catholics there concerning the relations of Church and State in the United States. These notions he described in an article which he published in the *Catholic World* for March, 1898, under the title, "America as Seen from Abroad," describing the difficulties an American Catholic had in persuading Europeans of the truth about the position of the Church here.

But the *pons asinorum* is reached [wrote Bishop Keane] when they come to ask him about American relations between church and state. They have been used to either church establishment or church oppression, church patronized or church persecuted. A condition in which the church neither seeks patronage nor fears persecution seems to them almost inconceivable; and when our American assures them that such is the condition in his country, they think him more than ever a dreamer. . . . They cannot imagine a separation of church and state which means simply that each leaves, and is bound to leave, the other

free and independent in the management of its own affairs; each, however, respecting the other, and giving the other moral encouragement and even substantial aid when circumstances require or permit. This, they recognize, while indeed a physical separation of church and state, would be in reality their moral union. Nay, they will acknowledge that a moral union of the kind would probably be more advantageous to both church and state than a union which would tend to blend and entangle their function, with a probable confusion of wholly distinct ends and methods, likely to prove pernicious to both sides. And among past and present Europeans they can find plenty of sad illustrations to bring the truth home to them. But, all the same, when our American assures them that such is really the relation of church and state in this country, and that, considering the circumstances of the times, it is the only practicable or even desirable one, then they are quite convinced that he is not only a dreamer, but even unsound in the faith.

If some of the Catholics of Europe at the turn of the century found it difficult to understand how the Church could function in a free and democratic society along American lines without imperiling the doctrinal integrity of the Catholic Faith, this was not a phenomenon confined to Europe or to that day. The same sort of arguments have been heard frequently of late in this country. Critics of the Church have adduced the teaching of Catholic theologians on the ideal union of Church and State, in the abstract, as detrimental to American in-

stitutions, without noting the qualifications which Leo XIII and others have laid down about the concrete order and the position of those who are nationals of a country where the Catholic religion is not held by a majority of the population. These critics further adduce examples from the history of Spain and Italy, where the Catholic Church enjoys a favored position, to show what would happen were Catholics to become a majority in the United States. But they fail to examine the cases of Ireland and Portugal—two predominantly Catholic countries — where there is no union of Church and State; in the case of Portugal, a concordat was signed with the Vatican in May, 1940 which demonstrated that the Holy See is quite willing to enter an arrangement other than that of union of Church and State.

ARCHBISHOP CUSHING ON CATHOLIC LOYALTY

Moreover, the tradition established by the American hierarchy on this question in the nineteenth century is still followed by their successors today. In October, 1947, Archbishop Richard J. Cushing, in an address to the national convention of the Holy Name Society in his see city of Boston, spoke of recent attacks on Catholic loyalty and said:

Yes, our critics continue, but Church and State! Surely, there, Catholic principles are at variance with those of the

American people. Well, first let it be said that Catholics are also among the American people. Catholics, we have already said, have gained as much from the American system as have their neighbors, and have given to the defense of that system the full share of brain and brawn and blood. Catholics grow weary of efforts to resurrect from the limbo of defunct controversies . . . the alleged danger from the Catholic side of union of Church and State in America.

At this point the Archbishop of Boston quoted the statement of Cardinal Gibbons in 1909 which I cited above and then added: "So spoke in his day Cardinal Gibbons. So do we speak in our day."

ARCHBISHOP McNICHOLAS

And three months later, the chairman of the Administrative Board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, which is the most authoritative body in the Catholic Church of this country, issued a statement which was quite categorical in character. On January 25, 1948, Archbishop John T. McNicholas stated:

No group in America is seeking union of church and state; and least of all are Catholics. We deny absolutely and without any qualification that the Catholic bishops of the United States are seeking a union of church and state by any endeavors whatsoever, either proximate or remote. If tomorrow Catholics constitute a majority in our country, they would not seek a union of church and state. They would then, as now, uphold the Constitution and all its Amendments, recognizing the moral

obligations imposed on all Catholics to observe and defend the Constitution and its Amendments.

In a very thoughtful article which Will Herberg contributed to the November, 1952 issue of *Commentary* on "The Sectarian Conflict over Church and State," he referred to the recent discussions of this question in responsible Catholic journals, and then remarked: "There is a new Catholic attitude, and it would be well if the public knew more about it." Yet most of what has been quoted here is very old, though it has not been cited by controversialists as have the pontifical statements which, in abstract and universal terms, call for a union of Church and State. The American hierarchy has always held, and still holds, that separation of Church and State in this country is the practical solution of this age-old problem; and nowhere will the student of American history find that the Holy See has ever rebuked them for their stand.

It is from the ideas and experiences that have been tested by age that a people's traditions evolve. More than a century and a half is sufficient time to test the quality of any tradition. When one considers, therefore, that the position which I have been outlining has been held from 1784, when the future Archbishop Carroll was first found publicizing his acceptance of the American pattern of Church-State relations, to 1948, when the

late Archbishop McNicholas made unmistakably clear his whole-hearted avowal of the separation of Church and State in this country—and that no variation from this theme has been heard from an American Catholic bishop—this should constitute an argument entitled to respect.



Sigrid Undset on the New Paganism

At the basis of Sigrid Undset's counterattack on modern paganism was the conviction that the paganism which flourishes when Christianity is cast out is something quite different from the paganism of our ancestors. This truth is of vital moment today. "The old pagan religions were, or are, much more closely allied to Christianity than is the paganism of our own time," she wrote. "The old paganism was a love-poem to a God who remained hidden, or it was an attempt to gain the favor of the divine powers whose presence man felt about him." Christianity, therefore, brought to man the true and real answer to the riddles of life. The new paganism, on the other hand, is a declaration of war against a God who has revealed Himself. Its aim is to root out all religions. The old paganism was a reaching out towards a God. The new paganism, whatever its outward manifestation—worship of blood, race, state, or anything else—seeks to put man in the place of God.—NEW ZEALAND TABLET, *Dunedin, N. Z., May 13, 1953.*



The Lonely Apostle

The individual in labor and in management who in good conscience strives to maintain the highest standards of justice and cooperation in the employer-employee relationship often finds himself playing a lonely role. When he looks to the broader problem of working to build a better society, to build a world in which all men regardless of their creed or color will have the opportunity to live decently in peace and freedom, he may be easily overcome by the magnitude of the task and discount the importance of his efforts. Indeed his may be a small hammer, while the hammers which with mighty strokes are shaping the thinking of the world to an indifference to God's law and man's rights are huge and heavy. But the cause of justice and a better world needs the zealous service of numberless apostles, not discouraged but confident in the knowledge that their little hammers are weighted with the grace of God.—*The Rev. Joseph F. Donnelly in the CALDRON, New Haven, Conn.*

The Marian Library

STANLEY MATHEWS, S.M.

*Reprinted from the MARIANIST**

THE doctor on the telephone sounded disturbed. He told the priest on the other end of the long distance call that he had a real problem; he had just accepted a request to speak at a meeting of doctors on the medical aspects of the cures at Lourdes and Fatima. It was something of a challenge to the Faith, he said, and he needed help right away.

The doctor had knocked on the right door. Within an hour books, pamphlets and additional references were rushed from the Marian Library.

While not all patrons are in such a hurry, the doctor's request is typical of the hundreds of questions about the Blessed Virgin Mary which come to the Marian Library at the University of Dayton each year. "If it's about Mary we have it, or we will get it, or we will direct you to it," invites Father Lawrence W. Monheim, S.M., the founder and present director of the library. The ten years of service given by this Marian center bear this out, too, for in that time the library has helped countless people interested in Mary to increase their knowledge of her.

"Where can I get information on

the green scapular?" "Is St. Louis de Montfort's name spelled Grignon or Grignon?" (the saint spelled it both ways!) "Where did the devotion to Our Mother of Confidence originate?" "Is there a good book in English on the Assumption?" "Why do the Marianists call their devotion to Our Lady 'filial piety'?" "What is the address of the shrine of Our Lady of the Cape?"

Questions like these are presented to the staff of the Marian Library in a never-ending stream. And the answers provide opportunities to spread knowledge of Our Lady and devotion to her throughout the world. For in the ten years since its foundation, the Marian Library has received requests for information from almost every State in the union and from every continent on the globe, from non-Catholics as well as Catholics. And the staff is still recovering from the day a self-professed atheist strode into the library and, very business-like, demanded to know "what this Mariology is all about!"

While editors, authors, housewives, businessmen and students alike have availed themselves of the facilities of the library, grade school children in-

* 108 Franklin St., Dayton 2, Ohio, January, 1954

variably ask the most interesting and unexpected questions. One fifth-grader wanted a pamphlet on "Our Confidence Lady" and another, mixing the Blessed Mother's special privileges, asked about the "Perpetual Assumption." But naturally, serious scholars provide the bulk of the library's "business." Universities are continually calling upon its resources; California, Notre Dame, Ohio State, Columbia, Michigan State, Fordham and Catholic University are listed among the satisfied users.

Yet, though most time-consuming, answering research questions is by no means the only purpose of the Marian Library. When Father Monheim established it in 1943, he looked forward to the day when all books, pamphlets, magazines, as well as recordings, clippings and pictures of the Blessed Virgin would be collected, catalogued and made available to anyone, any place in the world, who was interested in the Mother of God.

COLLECTIONS IN EUROPE

This idea of a Marian Library was not new. Several large collections were already located in Europe. One large one, numbering over 10,000 volumes, has in recent years been placed in the care of the Servite Fathers of the International College of St. Alexis Falconeri. Another important collection of approximately the same size was established in 1942 by Rev. Leon

Arendt at Banneaux, Belgium, scene of an apparition of the Blessed Virgin in 1933. Here in America a Marian Library project was launched several years ago by the late Bishop Thomas J. Shahan and Monsignor Bernard McKenna at the Catholic University of America. It was to be organized in connection with the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception. About 500 volumes were collected, some of them very rare, but this project was later suspended and even the catalog record destroyed.

"In the United States," reported Father Monheim, "while some universities—notably Harvard, Notre Dame, Yale, Catholic University and the Jesuit seminary at Woodstock, Md.—housed important and large sections devoted to Mary in their libraries, a careful inquiry revealed that there simply was no active library of any size devoted exclusively to the works about our Blessed Mother. The Marian Library at the University of Dayton proposed, therefore, to fill a very definite Catholic library need."

To carry out the plan blueprinted for the Marian Library is a large-scale project — one obviously not realized in ten short years, perhaps not even in the lifetime of one man. In the field of books alone, for example, the total number of volumes about the Blessed Virgin is staggering. "We can only hazard a guess," one librarian has said, "that some-

where between 150 to 200 thousand have been written." For Our Lady has long been a favorite subject of authors since the early centuries of the Church. Works concerning her range from ponderous tomes of many volumes to the simple pamphlets of several pages; from deep theological studies to children's picture books; from literary masterpieces to literary atrocities. Yet from the viewpoint of research, even the most poorly written is a useful addition to the field, and should be catalogued.

OUT OF PRINT

Since such a large number of books have been written about Mary in all languages, the original objective of collecting all Marian books at the university admittedly was no small task. Yet a more practical handicap hampered progress. Every Catholic publisher contacted for books sent back the same discouraging message: only the very latest books about Mary could be purchased; the rest were out of print. During the first year of its existence, more than 80 per cent of the titles in English that the library attempted to buy were unavailable.

The man faced with this problem was Rev. Edmund J. Baumeister, S.M. A shift in personnel occasioned by World War II placed this priest in charge of the library in 1944. Father Baumeister, blessed with an organizational genius, happily hit upon the solution to the out-of-print book prob-

lem which provided the Marian Library with an extremely valuable reference tool.

If the Marian Library could not collect the books themselves, he thought, then why not keep a record of the libraries throughout the world in which the books could be found? If many valuable books could never reach the Marian Library, should it follow that these books were necessarily to be excluded from the service of the library? Through a carefully planned system, he developed a Union Catalog. This, in effect, gives the Marian Library a record of all the Marian books to be found in approximately one thousand libraries throughout the entire world. Now any inquirer can know the nearest library that has the book about Mary he is searching for.

"This is the most unique feature of our collection," notes Father Monheim, "and the one most often consulted. Since no other Union Catalog of Marian works exists in the world, it has been perhaps our most useful innovation."

A decade of hard work has seen only a partial realization of the original dream of the founder; much still must be done to increase and perfect the work. Yet the library now contains almost 6,500 books and several thousand pamphlets. Other materials are not neglected. Films, pictures, statues, clippings, magazines, newspapers, medals, stamps, relics—all of

Mary—are finding their way into the library gradually and the collection is daily growing.

Some special treasures are among these acquisitions. The staff of the Marian Library is proud of a book of papal encyclicals autographed by Pope Pius XII. Displayed prominently, too, are autographed works of Bishop Fulton Sheen, Father Daniel Lord, S.J., Franz Werfel and Fulton Oursler. One of the best collections of Marian stamps in the world will catch the eye of any casual visitor to the Library, as will the beautiful silver statue of Our Lady of the Pillar, a gift of the city council of Saragossa, Spain.

While emphasis has been primarily on collecting the printed word, other materials about Mary are added as opportunity and funds present themselves. For the Marian Library is truly a remarkable achievement. It has no endowment and no special budget. It exists and grows, completely dependent on the donations of friends.

To keep abreast of all events that concern Mary, the library receives over twenty Catholic newspapers from the United States, Canada and Europe. These are checked for pertinent items, which are then classified and inserted in the clipping file. A Marian Periodical Index to list the articles about Mary in magazines is also now in progress. The library receives and files almost every impor-

tant magazine in the world that deals with Mary.

Yet a library of books can easily become a static thing, a dead collection, a mere museum-piece. But Father Monheim has taken special pains that the Marian Library will remain a dynamic instrument in the Marian apostolate. "We can't love what we don't know," he says with characteristic finality; "we can't be devoted to a person of whom we are ignorant. So that's our job at the Marian Library—to make Our Lady better known."

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

The official motto of the Marian Library, "Never Enough About Mary," underscores this dynamism. The activities are even now expanding. Besides a *Booklist* enumerating 10,000 works about the Blessed Mother, a *Newsletter* published ten times a year keeps all interested in the current activities of the library and in the Marian apostolate abreast of the latest happenings. In 1952 the popular *Marian Reprints* were started. This series includes articles and documents of significance on the Blessed Virgin that emphasize her mission in the modern world.

To encourage the publication of books of excellent quality on Our Lady, the Marian Library last year inaugurated the Marian Library Medal, awarded for the best book published in the United States each year.

The first winner was Bishop Fulton J. Sheen for his beautifully written tribute to the Blessed Virgin, *The World's First Love*.

The latest means the Marian Library used to promote knowledge of Mary is the Marian Institute. First sponsored in June, 1953, it featured speakers and discussions on the theme "Mary and the Apostolate." The overwhelmingly favorable reaction has prompted plans for a second Institute on a theme appropriate to the Marian Year, "The Immaculate Conception."

1954 has been proclaimed by Pope Pius XII as a year especially dedicated to Mary. But for the Marian Library every year—and every day of every year—is dedicated to her. In the first ten years it has accomplished much for Our Lady; the next ten seem even more promising. Each day is an opportunity to tell increasing numbers of the glories of Mary. Each day is a chance to bring glory through her to her Divine Son. For the Marian Library truly there can never be "enough about Mary."



Joiners—Then and Now

It took some Americans more than a decade to discover the shortsightedness of supporting an organization just because it promises to combat an evil. And some still haven't learned the lesson. We mean not only the dwindling number of Communist dupes, but the increasing number of another kind of dupe who seems to feel that any individual or group professing enmity for Communism is therefore above suspicion. These latter-day joiners are less dangerous than the joiners of ten or fifteen years ago (whose stupidity they now equate with treason), but both groups are marked by the same impetuosity and the same childlike belief that all issues are either white or black. A few years ago the Red fronter said, in effect: "Social ills are great evils and I'll give my complete support to anyone who says he's against them." Today, a new kind of "front man" shouts: "Communism is a great evil and I'll give my complete support to anyone who says he's against it." Both kinds of fronters, for the most part, are loyal Americans, but both are foolish Americans. It's time we realize that both kinds of folly are dangerous to our country.—THE CATHOLIC TELEGRAPH-REGISTER, Cincinnati, Ohio, July 31, 1953.

The Industry Council Plan as a Form of Social Organization

JOSEPH P. FITZPATRICK, S.J.

Address delivered at the annual convention of the American Catholic Sociological Society, Milwaukee, Wis., December 28-30, 1952.

*Reprinted from THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW**

FOR the past few years, the members of the American Catholic Sociological Society have been discussing the Industry Council Plan (ICP), and its possible adaptation to American life. By and large, the discussions have been concerned with the plan as a form of economic organization related to political functions. In general, too little attention has been given to it as a form of social organization. Yet it should be clear that ICP will never exist as an effective organization of social economy, or as an instrument of social welfare, unless it becomes integrated into the social structure of the society in which it is adopted. It is precisely as a form of social organization that it will meet its greatest difficulties; it is only as a form of established social organization that it will operate effectively.

The general idea of ICP is quite familiar to people who have read Pius XI's *The Reconstruction of the Social Order (Quadragesimo Anno)*. ICP is the name adopted by the mem-

bers of the ACSS to indicate the organization of industries and professions which Pius XI proposed as a form of social reconstruction. It is based on the principle that men and women should not be organized as working class against employing class; but rather that they should be organized, employer and worker alike, according to the function they fulfill in society as makers of clothing or makers of automobiles, as teamsters, lawyers, doctors, etc. Through these organizations, all those engaged in a particular industry or profession may participate actively and democratically to control the activities of the entire industry or profession, and ensure that it functions for the common welfare.

In discussions about the plan, much attention has been given to the structure of the organization of the industry or profession, to its legal or political status, its economic functions, the extent of its authority, power of enforcement, etc. What deserves more attention, but has re-

* Loyola University, Chicago 26, Ill., October, 1953

ceived little, is the fact that the plan would have a profound effect upon the existing social relationships of men. It would presuppose changes in motivation; modification of complicated systems of status, prestige, authority; new concepts of the social function of work and business. In brief, ICP would be, more than anything else, a new social organization. As such it would have far-reaching effects which deserve much more consideration from our Catholic sociologists than they have yet received.

In this respect, we have not kept pace as Catholics with, let us say, the Missiologists. These scientists of Catholic mission activity are constantly concerned about the effect that Catholic life and doctrine will have on a particular culture to which they are introduced; what modifications the particular culture will require of Catholic life if it is to flourish there. They manifest a keen insight into, a remarkable understanding of, the development and change of social institutions.

Yet, in our discussion of ICP, though we are considering the introduction of a new idea or set of values into economic life, we do not manifest sufficient comprehension of the intricate problems of social change, of the fact that the existing social structure will seriously influence the nature of the Industry Councils, and that the Councils will

in turn have a profound effect on the social structure.

The present paper attempts to explore some of the problems involved in the relationship of ICP to social organization. It will discuss three points: 1) The nature of social organization in general, of social institutions and social changes; 2) ICP as a social institution; 3) The relationship of ICP to some of the established institutions of American society.

SOCIAL ORGANIZATION

For want of time, I shall center my discussion of social organization on the nature of the social institution. The term "institution" can lead to endless quarrels about terminology. For my own purpose, I shall use as my definition of social institution "a pattern of expected social relationships, or a form of expected social behavior which expresses an idea or a value." It is a pattern of social interaction which men come to look upon as something they can expect of others, and which others can expect of them. The intensity of obligation to these patterns varies: it may be looked upon as social custom, like the exchange of Christmas gifts; or it may be considered as morally binding, like monogamy in marriage. It may be enforced through social custom alone, like our American pattern of courtship; or it may become formalized in a set of laws and en-

forced by sanction, such as collective bargaining.

There is some idea or value expressed in every social institution. The relationship between the idea and the expected behavior may be very clear, such as the relationship between white supremacy and segregation; or the relationship may be very obscure, such as the relationship between a particular form of dress and modesty.

Since there is an idea expressed in every social institution, it is important that the idea be the right one. The purpose of the institution is to make it easy for people to put the idea into practice, or to compel them by social pressure to put it into practice. When the wrong idea is expressed in an institution, such as a caste system or a practice of racial segregation, it makes it extremely difficult for a person to put the right idea of charity and justice into practice.

Secondly, it is important to observe that the very same pattern of behavior can express one idea in one social system, and quite another idea in a different social system. Collective bargaining, for example, plays quite a different role in a Russian industry, a German industry, an American industry, and it would have no role in the cottage industries of India or Japan. Serfdom might not have been an injustice in tenth-century France. It would be a very serious

injustice in our twentieth-century America. This must be kept in mind as ICP is discussed in relation to different cultures.

DIFFICULT TO CHANGE

Now social organization is determined by the nature of these institutions; it consists of a number of institutions related to one another. What is significant about social institutions is this: that once they become established it is extremely difficult to change them. Within the web of social institutions people strive to achieve the values they associate with human life, strive to express the meaning that life has for them. Within that web of institutions they generally find the definition of their own importance, the things that bind them in close loyalty to their fellows in a life that has a common meaning, the satisfactions of social solidarity, of recognition, of affection. These things become so intertwined in economic activities, artistic effort, religious devotion that it becomes almost impossible to break them. And if anything is significant in social history, it is this: that people will suffer untold economic loss rather than sacrifice the social forms and institutions with which they have come to identify the real meaning of their life. Even when changed for the better, they are generally changed only with much sweat and tears, often with much blood.

As an example of this, consider the gradual development of that social organization which is used as an example of the type of social integration which ICP aims at—the medieval commune.

CORPORATE UNITY

Generations of violence and war were required before the communes were established, before medieval man could wrest his freedom from the feudal lords. Some of the bloodiest wars were fought against Princes of the Church who opposed the communes as a revolt against divine authority. These men, therefore, who created the communes had an *idea*: an idea of a greater dignity of man which demanded greater responsibility as free citizens in society, a participation in the decisions of their own community. But the pattern of social relationships in which this idea was to be expressed was not at all clear; that is, they did not write a plan and then apply it. Rather, in conflict, the realization of the value of the common loyalty that bound them together as citizens drove them on, and gradually, after much trial and error, after experiment and examination, they forged the patterns of behavior in which this idea found expression. Eventually they were able to organize the city's life around that burning sense of corporate unity in which they had won their freedom. It was not come by easily.

Sometimes we underestimate the power of these forms of social organization. In the first draft of one of our little pamphlets, the author had written: "It is easy to set up a government in which the state is supreme, such as totalitarianism; it is easy to set up a philosophy in which the individual is supreme." I think if social history teaches us anything, it teaches us just the opposite. To say it is easy to set up totalitarianism is to overlook such things as the planned famines of Russia, or the present resistance to the collectives in Yugoslavia. And to say that individualism is easily set up overlooks the centuries of frightful social suffering that attended the rise of industrial capitalism.

In fact, is this not the very problem that has created difficulties for the Point Four Program, the effort to develop the underdeveloped areas of the world? If a new method of production or improved techniques of farming threatens to change the established and traditional ways of doing things, people are extremely reluctant to permit that change. Thus Point Four has always faced a social problem much more than an economic one.

So much for the question of social organization. All of this seems a lengthy introduction to the topic of my paper, but its importance, I am sure, is quite clear.

ICP AS A SOCIAL INSTITUTION

The Industry Council Plan is a social institution. Its *idea* is a concept of society in which the individual achieves the fullest expression of his personality in an orderly relationship to social groups. It is based on a concept of human dignity, of social justice and social charity. It suggests a pattern of social behavior in which this will be realized. But two things are clear in ICP: first, the pattern of behavior outlined in the plan has definitely been suggested by the evils of industrial capitalism that subordinated social welfare to the needs of production; second, the pattern of behavior is primarily aimed at subordinating the productive system to the social welfare.

Now it seems that the discussions of ICP by sociologists should proceed along the following lines. They must consider the idea which is at the heart of the plan and ask themselves: with reference to this particular social structure (of United States, or Latin America, or Germany or India), what pattern of social relationships will enable the people in that social structure to give expression of this idea in the best possible way? What institutions already existing in that culture are compatible with this idea? What institutions are not compatible? What social changes will be implied in the adoption of this idea, etc.? In other words, the

plan has meaning only in relationship to particular social organizations. Let me illustrate.

In the first place, the big problem in the largest areas of the world is not the subordination of society to production. It is quite the opposite. It is not the problem in which the individual is given too much freedom to the detriment of the social group. It is rather the problem of the individual being too deeply submerged in the social group, or too restricted by social institutions.

It is important to make a few comments on this aspect of the societies of the world. For, in our outlines of the plan, we have discussed the proposition of developing the Industry Councils on an international level. And, on other occasions, we have discussed the plan as a "natural" form of social organization.

Let us take China, for instance, i.e., China before the Red conquest. Life in rural China was well integrated with a system of family and clan loyalties. Production was woven into a network of social relations in which the individual had little meaning except in reference to the family, and in which family loyalty often immobilized large sections of valuable land that is used for graves. Here was social control of production—and excessive social control over the individual. Yet this land held a large population almost three times that of the United States. Now against the

background of this type of social organization, ICP as we have defined it would have very little meaning. It would have to be re-defined in terms of those institutions of social control which had existed for centuries, i.e., the families and clans. And, as I shall indicate later, ICP makes little explicit provision for family organization. Granted that there were guilds in the Chinese cities, only a very small proportion of Chinese ever lived in cities.

Or take India, where again there is a population almost three times that of the United States. Here the occupations are socially organized to such an extent that they form a caste system. (This is not entirely accurate since caste and occupation are not completely identified, but it comes fairly close.) Apart from the system of castes, the institution that regulates the social life of India is the village council. Here again there is a noticeable predominance of social loyalties and regulations over economic interests, and a form of social organization in which the individual does not enjoy the freedom and fulfillment we would demand. Now when we speak of ICP as a natural form of society, we must define what we mean in relation to the social organization that has existed in India, or China or the Near East for centuries.

Our inquiry might take the following form: how can we release the

individual person for dignity and self-perfection while still retaining enough of those social systems to assure the predominance of the social welfare and the common good? The concept of the common welfare that we spell out is, humanly speaking, generations away among these peoples, and social development in these areas may take a form which would make our definition of ICP a meaningless instrument. Nor have I said anything about the terrible problem that faces us in the widespread institution of peonage in Catholic countries.

To suggest, as a pattern of social relationships, the highly complicated pattern of Industry Councils is to overlook the terrible problem of modifying the ideas and attitudes and behavior patterns of centuries. These are the problems that baffle the social scientists of the world today. And when we present the model of ICP as we have defined it, we must be careful to make sure that these social scientists know exactly what we mean and that we appreciate the problems of social organization which are involved.

ICP AND AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS

But let us come to the plan as it is proposed for the United States. In the first place we have experienced the evils which have suggested the plan as we define it: we definitely have a society where individualism

has had wide play and where social welfare has been subordinated to production and profit. Furthermore, the plan presupposes a widespread differentiation of function in society, and we also have this differentiation in our American social system. But most of all, the plan aims to integrate society by organizing men as individuals through the medium of their occupation or profession. There is no indication of any direct organization of society on the basis of the family. The family is only indirectly affected by the decisions of the Councils. This also is well adapted to our American structure where the pull of occupations has atomized society to an extent that the family has difficulty surviving as a stable social unit. But it is questionable whether we should not recognize more clearly that this may not be the most stable form of social organization.

Granted these compatibilities, nevertheless when we as sociologists contemplate a plan for the United States, we should begin by asking a key question: how does one define the idea of the "common good," the "subordination of economic activity to social welfare," in terms that make sense to the American people? Otherwise, we will give the impression of doing what we most wish to avoid: of imposing a blueprint of social organization on institutions which are not at all receptive to them.

Let us take the two aspects of the

idea of the plan: 1) individual dignity and freedom; 2) subordination of productive activities to social welfare. Our individualism is, in a sense, an excess of that freedom and human dignity which is part of the idea of the plan. What we cannot fail to overlook is the fact that Americans have always tended to think of our basic ideas of human dignity, freedom, opportunity for self-development in terms of free institutions and associations. Our society has been marked by an open class structure, by widespread upward mobility, by great opportunity in the development of our resources. We are all aware of the evils that have attended the expression of these values, but they are basic values, and they are sharply defined in the American mind. We have traditionally resisted compulsion. Therefore, to propose a pattern of behavior in which men will be compelled to do that which is for the common good runs the risk of being misunderstood and seriously misrepresented in the American mind.

STATEMENTS OF THE POPES

In the statements of the Popes they show themselves remarkably aware of the danger of imposing social patterns in areas to which they are not well adapted. For instance, Leo XIII says in *Rerum Novarum* when he speaks of workmen's associations: "All such societies, being free to exist, have the further right to adopt such

rules and organizations as may best conduce to the attainment of their objects. We do not deem it possible to enter into definite details on the subject of organization; this must depend on national character, on practice and experience, on the nature and scope of the work to be done, on the magnitude of the various trades and employments, and on other circumstances of fact and of time—all of which must be carefully weighed."

Pope Pius XI emphasizes the same thing and in *Quadragesimo Anno* applies it specifically to the problem of the Industry Councils: "The teaching of Leo XIII on the form of political government, namely, that men are free to choose whatever form they please, provided that proper regard is had for the requirements of justice and of the common good, is equally applicable in due proportion, it is hardly necessary to say, to the guilds of the various industries and professions." The Popes had a good sense of sociological reality.

Along this same line of individual freedom, Americans have a rather confusing record when it comes to questions of organization. *Fortune* (Feb. 1951) calls the American the "busy, busy citizen" always joining, always active in associations. But a

number of studies seem to indicate that organized activity is predominantly a middle class and upper class phenomenon.¹ Not even the labor union has thrown this balance toward the working classes, since less than one-fourth of the work force is in unions. Even with the unions we have had some sad experience with the lethargy of men in being concerned about their own welfare. Nevertheless ICP gives the impression of multiplying organizations tremendously, which would demand an extraordinary degree of participation from people who have either never bothered to join organizations or have never bothered to be active in those which they have joined.

What may happen if the organizations are taken over by a small group of clever organizers, or what may happen should the Government decide to usurp them can only be left to the imagination. To say that this will not happen under ICP is to misread the warnings of history. To suggest, as some have done, that the creation of the formal institution will evoke the spontaneous participation of the members is to deny all that Industrial Sociology has been able to tell us about the participation of men in any organization. On the other hand, we must consider the problem of bigness in the organiza-

¹ Mirra Komarovsky, "The Voluntary Associations of Urban Dwellers," *ASR*, Dec. 1946.

tion of our ordinary economic and social life. We must avoid giving the impression of multiplying huge organizational bodies in which the individual is lost.

ECONOMIC ACTIVITY AND THE COMMON GOOD

From the second point of view, the subordination of economic activity to the common good, the two institutions through which Americans have gradually been compelling business to come to terms with the needs of human life have been government and the labor union. And these have been surprisingly effective in bringing the benefits of American industry to our people. Now just reflect for a moment on the length of time and the intensity of effort that were required to enable these two institutions to do what they have done. At least ninety years of steady effort have been expended by labor unions, and they are still not so strong nor so extensive as they should be. And years of patient effort and toil went into the efforts of government representatives before we got such a thing as the Norris-LaGuardia Act or the Wagner Act. This is the background against which we must think of ICP.

What remains, therefore, is for us to attempt to analyze the direction and the driving forces that underlie the social institutions of American

life. Despite the emphasis on self-interest, these forces are often moving in very healthy directions. This has been well analyzed, for instance, by a man like Frank Tannenbaum.² He points out that, with all their stumbling after what they thought was a fair break in American life, the labor unions are proving to be a conservative element, forcing industry to come to terms with human life so that, as a human thing, it might survive. Without realizing what they were doing, they were re-creating an integration in their occupation that was to make American industry a more stable thing because it made it more human. In another recent book,³ C. Wright Mills makes an interesting effort to estimate the changes that are taking place in American institutional structures and discusses the implications the changes will have for American life.

It is in sensing the direction of these forces that we, as sociologists, could make our greatest contribution. But our vision must never be cloaked in language that is bitter to the American mind. Certainly, studies of communication have had much to tell us about the terrible effects of "charged words" or "charged symbols." We must not overlook this. Therefore any suggestion of planning, of compulsion, of a model that

² F. Tannenbaum, *A Philosophy of Labor* (N. Y.: Knopf, 1951).

³ C. W. Mills, *White Collar* (N. Y.: Oxford, 1951).

represents "Our Plan," much as we may qualify it, is still calculated to arouse the needless resentment of some Americans.

It is better to keep the idea, the value, clearly in view. Then we may analyze the forces in American life which are tending toward this idea

and this value. And there are many such forces at work. It is better to be satisfied with trying to point out the short steps by which these forces may progress to healthier forms of social organization, than to propose an elaborate plan which may be totally rejected because it is not understood.



U. S. Responsibility

It is interesting to note that the Catholic Church in America recently reached the distinction of having 200 members in its hierarchy. That makes it the third largest in the world. First, of course, is Italy and second, before the Red regime, was China. Now in third place is our own country which even within living memory was a mission country. There is a temptation to preen ourselves perhaps in this new-found distinction; we have, we may feel, surpassed the older Catholic nations at least in numbers and the tonic of this news can be quite heady for us. Certainly it is amazing that in the last fifty years the Catholic hierarchy in America has doubled, but this is not strictly a tribute to our zeal but in some measure the result of immigration and simple geography.

What we should be reminded of over and over again is the responsibility this position places upon us in making our proper contribution to the life of the Church. If in moments of their greatness the Church was able to look to other nations for those who would carry on her work in the world, she must surely look now with particular hope toward us in the time of our strength. Our numbers will mean very little indeed if we fail to take our proper place in the life of the Church and in its work; our final statistics to be impressive must be found in the list of the saints of God.—THE PILOT, *Boston, Mass., Feb. 13, 1954.*



How Many Read?

The *Catholic Digest* has released a survey which shows that forty-four per cent of the Catholics in America do not read a Catholic publication regularly.

Interviewing a cross-section of 104 million Americans over 18 years of age, the *Digest* asked: "Do you happen to read any religious magazines or newspapers regularly?" This was asked of Protestants, Catholics and Jews.

Results show that 58 per cent of Protestants do not read a Protestant publication regularly, and 81 per cent of the Jews do not read any Jewish publication regularly.—THE BULLETIN, *Augusta, Ga., Jan. 23, 1954.*

Happiness in Marriage

REV. JOHN A. O'BRIEN

*Reprinted from THE FAMILY DIGEST**

MOST young couples "marry because we love each other." Their wedding was preceded by a courtship in which friendship ripened into love, which now seeks its fulfillment in the joys of the nuptial relation. They have tasted of romance. Love's young dream has whispered into their ears the age-old happiness, and the joys of consummated love are then the motives which prompt young people to marry. They embody the legitimate satisfaction of the sexual hunger and the spiritual elements which twine like tendrils of a vine around the nuptial relationship.

These are the subjective ends of marriage. While secondary in the eyes of nature and of the race to the procreation of offspring, they are the primary considerations in the minds of the young couple. They are natural, legitimate, praiseworthy and important ends of marriage. Indeed if they are not achieved in a large measure, the permanence of the union very often is endangered.

There is a large physical element in the marital relationship. The mating instinct, the hunger of sex, is of divine origin. When exercised in ac-

cordance with God's plan in the holy institution of marriage, it acquires a high nobility. In bringing the reverent expression of affection to his spouse, man finds that his self-surrender floods his own being with the splendor and glory of a love multiplied manifold. It is the unique glory of love that in giving the donor loses nothing, but is himself enriched. In speaking the language of love, bride and groom find their voices delicately attuned to the ears of God. For love is God's vernacular.

"When we think of the physical expression as part of the whole pattern," observes Wingfield Hope, "let us remember that God has appointed that natural human act and that it is a part of His whole scheme for our married happiness. It gives honor and glory to Himself; it gives husband and wife a share in His work of creation; it increases the mutual love of husband and wife in its completing of their unity, and it should help to raise their hearts to God in thanksgiving for His goodness to them.

"If this expression is thus made to His honor and glory and as an essential part of His whole plan, can we

* Our Sunday Visitor Press, Huntington, Ind., August, 1952

not persuade ourselves that it is right experience in the natural life, which is only spoiled by loss of contact with the designer of the natural life? And since that natural life is united with God's supernatural purposes, is it right to imagine that it should be made drearily and without enjoyment of the pleasure which He has attached to it?

"That pleasure is perfectly safe if it is kept near to Him, accepted from Him and thanked for in our prayers to Him. . . . It is very sad when the wife is, on the contrary, imbued with false ideas of modesty and imagines that the pleasure resulting from the marriage act is one which will appeal to the husband but which a modest woman must always find repugnant."

Because it ministers to the sacrificial labors of child-bearing and child-rearing, the conjugal relation brings into play the psychical and spiritual elements which constitute the deepest and most satisfying qualities in human love. Since the act is in conformity with the moral law and thus pleasing to the conscience of the individual, it draws the soul into the communion of love and thus gives it a new height and depth and meaning. It is the bane of all sex activity outside marriage that the moral nature is offended and thus, in the very act of attempted physical gratification, the soul thunders its stern condemnation.

Since the distinctive element in

man's nature is not the physical, which the animals also have, but the spiritual, wherein his true dignity lies, it follows that physical gratification bought at the expense of conscience is the bargain of a fool. It yields only nausea and remorse. The conjugal relation embodies the highest and noblest joy of sex because it involves the hearty approval of conscience and therefore the intimate participation of the soul. That is why the encyclical *On Christian Marriage* says that in marriage the souls of the contracting parties are knit together even more deeply and more intimately than are their bodies.

The conjugal act does not have, therefore, as its sole end the procreation of offspring. Such a view would lower man to the level of animals because it would regard him as essentially a physical organism. The conjugal relation involves physical and spiritual elements whose values and importance can scarcely be overestimated. It effects a tremendous deepening of human love, intensifies its unity and strengthens its permanence as can no other action.

NATURE SPEAKS

Nature itself bears witness to this truth. In the animal kingdom the mating instinct is stimulated to action only when the female is "in season" and the act is called for as a means of procreation. But in human beings the case is far different. Nature it-

self separates the unitive from the reproductive function to the remarkable extent that during more than three-fourths of the time periodically available for the connubial relation, reproduction in all its stages is physically impossible. Here is an arrangement of nature's own contrivance, an arrangement whose significance has not been sufficiently understood or stressed.

It is nature's way of saying: in affording a married couple abundant opportunity for the performance of the conjugal act when conception is physically impossible, we make unmistakably clear that the act has other important ends. Those ends are the achievement of a deeper unity through the fusion of two hearts and souls, the blending of two personalities into a single corporate entity, the deepening of understanding and sympathy, and the strengthening of the bond of a permanent and deathless love. These are the ends which mirror most accurately the distinctive nature of man as an intelligent and spiritual being.

"To regard wedded love," points out Dietrich von Hildebrand, "as exclusively an objective means to the union of wedlock, and the latter in turn as a means to procreation, would be to subordinate entirely man as a human being to man as an animal—a thoroughly materialistic view. . . . To overlook the union between physical sex and love or its significance

and to recognize only the purely utilitarian bond between sex and the propagation of the race is to degrade man."

PERFECTING THE INTERIOR LIFE

The wholesome influence of the conjugal relationship in fostering mutual love and in perfecting the spiritual life of the married couple is brought out by no one more clearly or more beautifully than by Pius XI in his encyclical *On Christian Marriage*. According to His Holiness, the primary purpose of this outward expression of love is "that man and wife help each other day by day in forming and perfecting themselves in the interior life, so that through their partnership in life they may advance ever more and more in virtue, and above all that they may grow in true love toward God and their neighbor."

It may occasion surprise to note that the encyclical terms the end just mentioned "the primary purpose" of the marriage relation. The encyclical makes clear, however, in what sense this is to be understood. It states that the mutual good which the spouses can achieve by bringing out the best in each other's nature "may truly be called even the primary cause and reason of marriage, provided that marriage is understood, not in the narrower sense as an institution for the due begetting and rearing of children, but in the wider sense as an in-

imate communion, association and companionship in all life."

CONJUGAL LOVE IS HOLY

No one, therefore, exalts the beauty, the nobility and the holiness of conjugal love more highly than the Church. Indeed, she views it as a mighty stimulant to the growth of that universal love which embraces God and all mankind. The high esteem in which the Church holds conjugal love is in sharp contrast to the Puritan conception, which views procreation as its sole end. Thus the Calvinist evangelist Whitefield (1714-1770) reflected this view when he proudly asserted that love had nothing to do with his courtship. "God be praised," he said, "if I know my own heart at all, I am free of this stupid passion the world calls love."

The Catholic view is mirrored in an old Catholic nuptial prayer which speaks beautifully of marriage as "the mystery of love." The prayer runs:

O God, at the creation of mankind, making woman from man, Thou hast already ordained that there should be a union of the flesh and of sweet love . . . Lord our God, Thou hast created man pure and immaculate and still Thou wishest that in procreation of the generations one be made from the other by the mystery of love.

How beautifully expressed is this ethical insight into the sweet mystery of holy love.

In an analysis of conjugal love, as penetrating as it is thought-provok-

ing, Hildebrand points out how it differs from all other loves or friendships, and approximates most closely the love of the soul for its heavenly bridegroom, Jesus Christ. All other friendships involve a "we" relationship in which partners remain side by side, in which they walk side by side, or even hand in hand.

"But two human beings," observes Dietrich von Hildebrand, "can also turn and face one another, and in touching one another, in an interpenetrating glance give birth to a mysterious fusion of their souls. They become conscious of one another, and each making the other the object of his contemplation and responses can spiritually immerse himself into the other. This is the "I-Thou" relationship, in which the partners are not side by side, but face to face." He continues:

Of all terrestrial communions, conjugal love is the most pronounced form of an I-Thou relation. The beloved person is the object of our thoughts, sentiments, will, hope and longing; the beloved becomes the center of our life, as far as created goods are concerned. He whose heart is filled with such conjugal love lives not only with the beloved but for the beloved. Certainly such an I-Thou relation in its purest form exists only between the human soul and its heavenly bridegroom, Jesus.

In the last analysis we must live only for Him, and in marriage, too, the two partners live together for Him. But in the realm of created goods conjugal love means living for one another; compared with all other human relation-

ships the two partners live in a definite I-Thou communion.

In other words, the most complete self-surrender and the most perfect fusion of personalities are achieved only in marriage. It is the source of man's deepest and most abiding happiness—a happiness for which there can be no substitute on this earth.

LOVE WITH UNDERSTANDING

In order that the conjugal action yield the physical, psychical and spiritual satisfaction and happiness intended by God and nature, it is well for the bridal couple to receive guidance before their wedding from the Catholic family physician, concerning this subject. Parents could and should assist in this important matter. But frequently they are reticent or find their vocabularies too limited. Experience shows that ignorance of the physiology and psychology of sex is a frequent cause of marital maladjustment and unhappiness.

That condition is further aggravated when either or both of the spouses have the erroneous conception that the relationship is a condescension to their animal nature and is devoid of spiritual values. Taking cognizance of these misconceptions, Father Gerald Vann, O. P., warns against "the danger that, through false moral standards, the young wife or husband will come to regard the marital act of physical union as permitted indeed, but to be got over shamefacedly and always in the fear

that anything other than the strict necessities of this so simple act will be sinful."

He speaks frankly of the "brutality, conscious or unconscious, of omitting the preliminaries and the epilogue." Such omissions lead to a frustration of the physical and psychical hungers which God intended should be satisfied in the conjugal relationship. Wingfield Hope writes:

It is a tragedy when the marriage relationship is made difficult and the coming of children delayed by a perfectly pointless ignorance of what every married person should know, and it is scarcely ever safe for the engaged couple to assume that they need no practical instruction just because they have a general idea of the marriage act. . . . Many a tragedy in married life might have been averted by a simple acceptance of the physical pleasure inherent in God's plan for married happiness and married fruitfulness, and by an understanding that the physical pleasure is excellent as a part of the whole plan, but that it is profaned if it is regarded as a 'necessary evil' or as something inherently disreputable which is legalized by matrimony.

The simple fact is that there are enormous differences in the physiology and psychology of the two sexes. These differences come to the focal point in the conjugal relation. They must therefore be properly understood if their needs are to be intelligently met. The failure to do so is likely to lead to frigidity, psychical antipathy and even estrangement.

Here, as elsewhere, knowledge is power. When good-will and affection are illuminated by an understanding of the distinctive needs of each partner, the expression of love will not be blind and riotous, but will be conducive to the deepest happiness of both husband and wife. Unless the expression of conjugal attachment is guided by intelligence, it will fail to achieve "the fostering of mutual love" which the Holy Father stresses as of such primary importance.

While this field abounds with the writings of those who treat marriage from a wholly materialistic viewpoint and overemphasize the physical side,

we must not scorn the deeper insight and better understanding made possible by the work of physicians, psychologists and other scientific scholars in this field. A conference with the Catholic family physician, supplemented by parental counsel, will preclude the possibility of maladjustments and will ensure the maximum of physical, psychical and spiritual values from the considerate and reverent fulfillment of the communion of conjugal love. By receiving their information and guidance from Catholic sources, the young couple will be safeguarded from the unwholesome views of pagan writers.



Lip Service

Lip service in lieu of action born of sound conviction and good-will constitutes a terrifying menace to the so-called American pattern of life. The great doctrine of the Declaration of Independence that "all men are created equal" is constantly made the theme of resounding oratory in our legislative halls and is not infrequently a source of pride to citizens. And yet in the country to which that famous Declaration gave birth lives prejudice against races and creeds. Prejudice against Negro, Jew and Catholic is grievously in evidence and continuously is being fed by those who consider themselves American without knowing what American means. Extension of this prejudice beyond our boundaries is isolating America from the rest of the world. Hatred inherent in prejudice is atomizing our own society as well as that of the world. Individuals and nations are separated by hate. Never more than in the ominous present is division in society to be feared and shunned.—MAGNIFICAT, *Manchester, N. H., June, 1953.*

Why I Don't Practise Medicine in a "Better" Neighborhood

CHRISTOPHER HODGES, M.D.

*Reprinted from WORK**

THE doctor's life is one tremendous opportunity for charity. Not just in giving free medical care—that's the narrow notion of charity. But what I mean is the opportunity to make his whole profession an expression of love for God and man.

You are roused from bed at two a.m. by a call from the nearby police station. "Got a bleeding drunk here, Doc—he's in bad shape," the sergeant says.

Sleepily you arrive at the station to find a patient who is so numb drunk that he doesn't feel the deep cigaret burn on his lower lip. His clothes are soaked in blood, liquor and urine. His unshaven face is blankly hopeless.

As you look into his eyes, you ask yourself: "Must I see Christ in this man, too?" And as you examine him, you answer your own question: "Of course."

You can't make any hard and fast rules on how to express charity in action. This applies particularly to what kind of advice you give someone about his personal problem.

When I was a young doctor, I followed the rule of pulling no punches. A tragic experience quickly cured me of that.

One afternoon a homosexual came into my office, and when he asked me about some of his personal problems, I spelled out for this young man the Christian view of sex. I saw that I had opened for him an entirely new vista, but I didn't realize that my words might be too much for him. At three o'clock that night I got a phone call informing me the young man had jumped out a window to his death.

Now I realize that your respect for a person must recognize the house that he has built for himself. If you knock down his foundation, his whole house is shattered.

At the other extreme you may find, after spending time with a patient, that he is one who can understand only the blunt approach. I recall a man who thought he was too ill to get out of his hospital bed. So I chided him for laziness. He jumped out of bed as though to take a swing

at me. Fortunately for me, it quickly dawned on him that his energetic reaction only proved my point.

CHARITY IN SOCIAL LIFE

In social contacts, too, you have an opportunity to practise charity. At parties even strangers feel compelled to sketch their medical history to you and to double-check their own doctor's diagnosis. Directly or indirectly, they ask you: "What do you think of my case?" I know of one doctor who answers this question rather brutally. "I couldn't tell you without giving a complete physical," he replies. "Would you mind stripping to the waist?"

Naturally, few doctors use this sledge-hammer approach. As adroitly as possible, however, you have to tell such persons that the doctor who has examined their problem closely is in the best position to make the diagnosis. Then you excuse yourself to get another martini.

You can't forget your responsibility to other doctors. After all, when a patient comes to you with a story about what another doctor did, it is easy to slur the doctor. You don't have to say: "That doctor is an oaf." All you have to do is murmur with amazement, "Is that so?" And you've won yourself a patient.

There are few other occupations in which, hour after hour, you dramatically see the need for a spirit of serving your fellow man. The suffer-

ing you meet naturally arouses the instinct to help. I personally know many doctors who regularly give a day a week to charity work in a hospital. In how many other occupations—even in the well-paid ones—is there such generosity?

My own practice is largely in a poor neighborhood made up of a mixture of races and nationalities. At one time I shared an office in a building where I had to sneak Negro patients in by a side entrance. For six years now, however, I've had my own practice where I can assist people regardless of their race or pocketbook.

Even the doctor who starts out in a modest way is tempted to hunt for a cozy practice in a suburb or on a respectable boulevard. When you have established such a practice on a sound basis, you are a "success." But when you explain that you don't plan to move your practice into a richer neighborhood, some people raise their eyebrows. It seems incomprehensible to them that a doctor would actually *want* to spend his time in a poorer neighborhood when he has a chance to "better himself" with a more prosperous clientele.

I don't picture myself as the crusader type, but I feel I do have a certain responsibility to the medical profession as a whole. I have the duty to do my part in making sure that it serves the needs of all the sick.

Unfortunately some of the most

vehement supporters of hospital segregation are doctors. Wherever I can, in the hospitals where I have connections, I try to throw my weight on the other side.

Thank God, some progress is being made. Recently one of the Catholic hospitals where I take my patients decided to eliminate their all-Negro ward. Negro patients are now allowed in every ward. (It already had Negro nurses on the staff.)

FAMILY OBLIGATIONS

The pressure on the time of doctors is so great that most of them forget their family obligations. At one time I would leave for the office at nine in the morning and not return till nine or later each night. I soon realized that a routine like that would only contribute to the high divorce rate among doctors. Now my office and apartment are set up side by side. Busy or not, I can usually have all my meals with the family.

Another temptation in the profession is to live in a kind of ivory tower. This applies even to the doctor with a dedication to his profession and his family. But you've just got to *make* time to keep in touch outside medical and family circles.

I attend not only medical confer-

ences but also the monthly meetings of the parish Holy Name Society and the Third Order of St. Francis. I read not only the professional journals but also *Commonweal*, *America* and *Work*. That's the only way to keep a balance.

After all, a doctor's advice is sought on many lines. He is considered an expert not only in his own field of medicine but in civic affairs.

You're looked up to so often, in fact, that you can easily develop a superiority complex. You can begin to see yourself as a most generous Santa Claus going through life dispensing health and wisdom.

But, at the other extreme, you have the people who take a keen delight in knocking doctors. You hear cracks about how money-hungry doctors are, and these really hurt when they come from someone whom you charged only half your usual rate for house calls a month earlier.

You get the feeling at times that few people are really grateful for what a doctor does for them. But then, of course, it's easier to be charitable to those who pay you back both in money and in gratitude.

Anyhow, I didn't become a doctor to be paid off.



It is a fact that thousands of mothers of small children are working through sheer economic necessity because their husbands are ill, absent or paid low wages.—*Katherine Taft in Work, February, 1954.*

Case Against Seating Red China in U. N.

NICHOLAS DE ROCHEFORT

*Professorial Lecturer in Political Science,
American University*

*Reprinted from the WASHINGTON STAR**

BY WAY of an amendment to the State Department Appropriation bill, both the Senate and the House unanimously expressed opposition to admitting the Chinese Communist Government to the United Nations. This vote was in strong support of the clear-cut position previously taken by Secretary of State Dulles on the same issue.

Yet there seems to be spreading in America an insidious propaganda that this opposition is guilty of "negative approach, shortsightedness, obstruction" and the like. Such propaganda follows the stand officially taken by some free world countries which advocate unseating the Nationalist Chinese Government in the U. N. and its replacement by the Communists. These advocates argue that in relations between sovereign nations, a *de facto* power is recognized as the legal government of a nation when it controls the largest area of the national territory and effectively assures administration and public order. On the other hand, partisans of Red China in the U. N. claim that we have an obvious interest in establishing through the U. N. permanent amicable contacts with "a government in effective control of some 500 million people." And chairborne strategists of international politics add to these arguments the hint that a rivalry could develop in the U. N. between the two Communist giants: the Soviet Union and the Chinese People's Republic.

The democracies broke with the old cynical rule of the past, "He who has the stick is the master," when, during World War II, they refused to recognize the totalitarian puppet governments of Norway, Netherlands, Greece, Yugoslavia and others, although these governments controlled their national territory, carried out the administration and assured order—all by police terror. To the contrary, the democratic nations continued to recognize the governments-in-exile, which controlled no territory and had neither administration, police—nor power.

Member nations of the U. N. ought to respect this precedent, created

* 1101 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., Washington 4, D. C., Aug. 9, 1953

by themselves in their own conduct of international policy, and refuse to recognize the Chinese Communist regime, which was established through military conquest and is maintained by police terror. Red China's recognition by the U. N. unquestionably would signify the death of the association of democracies called the United Nations, for it would betray the spirit, defeat the purposes and violate the provisions of the U. N. Charter.

POSITIVE LAW OF THE UN

According to this Charter, the U. N. was founded for the purpose of establishing an international cooperation based on respect of the dignity of all human beings, on recognition of human rights and of the basic freedoms. A constant development of the freedoms, in particular, was the positive goal proclaimed by the Charter. This reference to freedoms and to human rights was not a mere statement of a vague ideological intent; it was, and it remains, the positive law of the organization. This law is enforceable in two ways. The admission of new members is restricted to states which, "in the judgment of the organization (the U. N.) are *able* and *willing* to carry out these obligations" (respect of human rights and of freedoms, and of peaceful solution of international conflicts). Another provision deals with the expulsion of members who no longer meet the standards of the U. N.

DENIAL OF HUMAN RIGHTS

The Communist Government of China has shown no sign of being willing to carry out the obligations set forth by the Charter. It denies the Chinese people any freedom of speech, press, assembly and most of all the freedom of creed, emphatically referred to in the Charter. It denies them the protection of law and instead stages abominable parodies of trials by mobs. Moreover, for the time being the Communist Government of China remains at war with the U. N.—an armistice is not peace. It is a temporary suspension of hostilities which can be denounced at any time. The Chinese "People's Volunteers" still occupy Korea, and it is too easily forgotten that they are in direct defiance of the decisions of the U. N. On the other hand, a simple cessation of an unlawful action would hardly entitle them to claim honorability.

The advocates of seating Red China may plead that the United States supported admission to the U. N. of Italy, a former adversary, after the signing of the peace treaty. The comparison is to the contrary ill chosen. The American Government advocated Italy's admission, not simply because

Italy was no longer at war with the democracies, but because Italy supplied proofs of its "willingness and ability" to abide by the Charter in establishing a democratic government which met the standards of the U. N.

UNABLE TO MEET UN STANDARDS

Red China is unable to meet those standards. Its constitution states that its government is a dictatorship (Art. I of the Organic Law of the Central Government of the Chinese People's Republic), based on the rule of democratic centralism. This rule, which is the fundamental rule of Communist regimes, prohibits any freedom of discussion or criticism of, let alone political opposition to, the established dictatorial power.

Before claiming its admission to the U. N., Communist China would have to make its constitution consistent with the Charter and prove by deeds that it lives up to the principles of the U. N. But then it would be no longer a Communist China. As long as it is ruled by the followers of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism, it will be unable to do so.

WOULD BE POLITICAL BLUNDER

While admission of Red China to the U. N. would signify the abdication and an eventual disintegration of this organization, it would also be a major political blunder of the free nations. The Soviet empire has been shaken by a series of active or passive revolts in the satellite states. If instead of giving the revolters encouragement and support, we strengthen the hand of the Soviet Union by granting one of its accomplices a place in the association of democracies, then the courageous opponents of Communism in the enslaved nations would rightly feel betrayed and abandoned. Any resistance to Communism would collapse, while the prestige of the free nations would suffer a severe and lasting setback.

The Asiatic countries, on the other hand, would be understandably impressed by the appearance of still another large Communist state in the U. N. They would be irresistibly driven into its orbit. Democratic India would lose its bid for the leadership of Asia to a totalitarian power while all of the Western nations would lose whatever little influence they retain in the countries of that continent.

The entry of Communist China in the U. N. would not be a defeat of the free world; it would be a rout.

Documentation

Religion in the Community of Nations

POPE PIUS XII

*Discourse of His Holiness to the Fifth Convention of Italian Catholic Jurists,
December 6, 1953.*

IT GIVES Us great satisfaction, beloved sons of the Union of Italian Catholic Jurists, to see you gathered round Us here and to bid you heartfelt welcome.

In the beginning of October another congress of jurists, dealing with international penal law, gathered in Our summer residence.¹ Your convention is rather national in character, but the subject it is treating, "the nation and the international community," touches again the relations between peoples and sovereign states. It is not by chance that congresses are multiplying for the study of international questions, be they scientific, economic, or political. The clear fact that relations between individuals of various nations, and between nations themselves, are growing in multiplicity and intensity makes daily more urgent a right ordering of international relations, both private and public; all the more so since this mutual drawing together is caused not only by vastly improved technological progress and by free choice, but also by the more profound action of an intrinsic law of development. This movement then is not to be repressed, but fostered and promoted.

I

In this work of expansion, communities of states and peoples, whether already existing or only a goal to be achieved, have naturally a special importance. They are communities in which sovereign states, that is to say, states which are subordinate to no other state, are united into a juridical community to attain definite juridical ends. It would give a false idea of these juridical communities to compare them to world empires of the past or of the present, in which different racial stocks, peoples and states become fused, whether they want it or not, into a single conglomeration of states. In the present instance, however, states, remaining sovereign, freely unite into a juridical community.

In this connection, the history of the world, which shows a continuous

¹ See *Catholic Mind*, LII, 1094 (Feb., 1954), pp. 107-118.

succession of struggles for power, no doubt might make the establishment of a juridical community of free states seem almost utopian. The conflicts of the past have too often been motivated by a desire to subjugate other nations and to extend the range of one's own power, or by the necessity of defending one's liberty and one's own independent existence. This time, on the contrary, it is precisely the will to prevent threatening conflicts that urges men toward a supranational juridical community. Utilitarian considerations, which certainly carry considerable weight, point towards the working out of peace; and finally perhaps it is precisely this mingling of men of different nations because of technological progress that has awakened the faith, implanted in the hearts and souls of individuals, in a higher community of men, willed by the Creator, and rooted in the unity of their common origin, nature and final destiny.

II

These and other similar considerations show that advance toward establishing a community of peoples does not look, as to a unique and ultimate norm, to the will of the states, but rather to nature, to the Creator. The right to existence, the right to respect from others and to one's good name, the right to one's own culture and national character, the right to develop oneself, the right to demand observance of international treaties and other like rights, are exigencies of the law of nations, dictated by nature itself. The positive law of different peoples, also indispensable in the community of states, has the office of defining more exactly the rights derived from nature and of adapting them to concrete circumstances, also of making other provisions, directed of course toward the common good, on the basis of a positive agreement which, once freely entered into, has binding force.

In this community of nations then every state becomes a part of the system of international law, and hence of natural law, which is both foundation and crown of the whole. Thus the individual nation no longer is—nor in fact was it ever—"sovereign," in the sense of being entirely without restrictions. "Sovereignty" in the true sense of the word means self-rule and exclusive competence concerning what has to be done and how it is to be done in regard to the affairs of a definite territory, always within the framework of international law, without however becoming dependent on the juridical system of any other state. Every state is immediately subject to international law. States which would lack this fullness of power, or whose independence of the power of any other state would not be guaranteed by international law, would not be sovereign. But no state could complain about a limitation of its sovereignty if it were denied the power of acting arbitrarily and without regard for other states. Sovereignty is not a divinization of the state, or omnipotence of the state in the Hegelian sense, or after the manner of absolute juridical positivism.

III

There is no need to explain to you students of law how the setting up, maintenance and operation of a real community of states, especially one

that would embrace all peoples, give rise to many duties and problems, some of them extremely difficult and complicated, which cannot be solved by a simple yes or no answer. Such would be the questions of race and origin, with their biological, psychological and social consequences; the question of language; the question of family life, with its relations, varying according to nation, between husband and wife, parents, the larger family group; the question of the equality or equivalence of rights in what regards goods, contracts and persons for the citizens of one sovereign state who either live for a short time in a foreign state or, retaining their own nationality, establish permanent residence there; the question of the right of immigration or of emigration, and other like questions.

The jurist, the statesman, the individual state, as well as the community of states, should here take account of all the inborn inclinations of individuals and communities in their contacts and reciprocal relations, such as the tendency to adapt or to assimilate, often pushed even to an attempt to absorb, or, contrariwise, the tendency to exclude and to destroy anything that appears incapable of assimilation; the tendency to expand, to embrace what is new, as on the contrary, the tendency to retreat and to segregate oneself; the tendency to give oneself entirely, forgetful of self, and its opposite, attachment to oneself, excluding any service of others; the lust for power, the yearning to keep others in subjection, and so on. All these instincts, either of self-aggrandizement or of self-defence, have their roots in the natural dispositions of individuals, of peoples, of races and of communities, because of their restrictions and limitations. One never finds in them everything that is good and just. God alone, the origin of all things, possesses within Himself, by reason of His infinity, all that is good.

From what We have said, it is easy to deduce the fundamental theoretical principle for dealing with these difficulties and tendencies: within the limits of the possible and lawful, to promote everything that facilitates union and makes it more effective; to remove everything that disturbs it; to tolerate at times that which it is impossible to correct, but which on the other hand must not be permitted to make shipwreck of the community, from which a higher good is hoped for. The difficulty rests in the application of this principle.

IV

In this connection, We wish to treat with you, who are happy to profess yourselves Catholic jurists, concerning one of the questions which arise in a community of peoples, that is, the practical co-existence of Catholic with non-Catholic states.

Depending upon the religious belief of the great majority of citizens, or by reason of an explicit declaration of law, peoples and member-states of the international community will be divided into Christians, non-Christians, those who are indifferent to religion, or consciously without it, or even professed atheists. The interests of religion and morality will require for the whole extent of the international community a well-defined rule,

which will hold for all the territory of the individual sovereign member-states of the international community.

According to probability and depending on circumstances, this ruling of positive law will be thus enunciated: within its own territory and for its own citizens, each state will regulate religious and moral affairs by its own laws; nevertheless throughout the whole territory of the international community of states, the citizens of every member-state will be allowed the exercise of their own beliefs and ethical and religious practices, in so far as these do not contravene the penal laws of the state in which they are residing.

For the jurist, the statesman and the Catholic state arises here the question: can they give their consent to such a ruling when there is question of entering and remaining in an international community?

Now, in regard to religious and moral interests, a twofold question arises: the first deals with the objective truth and the obligation of conscience toward what is objectively true and good; the second deals with the practical attitude of the international community towards the individual sovereign state and the attitude of the individual state toward the international community in what regards religion and morality. The first question can hardly be a matter for discussion and legal ruling between the individual states and the international community, especially in the case of a plurality of different religious beliefs within the international community. On the other hand, the second question can be of extreme importance and urgency.

V

Now to give the right answer to the second question. Above all it must be clearly stated that no human authority, no state, no community of states, whatever be their religious character, can give a positive command or positive authorization to teach or to do that which would be contrary to religious truth or moral good. Such a command or such an authorization would have no obligatory power and would remain without effect. No authority may give such a command because it is contrary to nature to oblige the spirit and the will of man to error and evil, or to consider one or the other as indifferent. Not even God could give such a positive command or positive authorization, because it would be in contradiction to His absolute truth and sanctity.

Another question essentially different is this: could a norm be established in a community of states, at least in certain circumstances, that the free exercise of a belief and of a religious or moral practice which possesses validity in one of the member states be not hindered by laws or coercive measures of the state throughout the entire territory of the community of nations? In other words, the question is raised whether in these circumstances "*non impedire*" or toleration is permissible, and whether consequently positive repression is not always a duty.

We have just adduced the authority of God. Could God, although it would be possible and easy for Him to repress error and moral deviation, in some cases choose the "*non impedire*" without contradicting His infinite perfec-

tion? Could it be that in certain circumstances He would not even communicate the right to impede or to repress what is erroneous and false? A look at things as they are gives an affirmative answer. Reality shows that error and sin are in the world in great measure. God reprobates them, but He permits them to exist. Hence the affirmation: religious and moral error must always be impeded, when it is possible, because toleration of them is in itself immoral, is not valid absolutely and unconditionally. Moreover, God has not given even to human authority such an absolute and universal command in matters of faith and morality. Such a command is unknown to the common convictions of mankind, to Christian conscience, to the sources of revelation and to the practice of the Church. To omit here other Scriptural texts which are adduced in support of this argument, Christ in the parable of the cockle gives the following advice: let the cockle grow in the field of the world together with the good seed in view of the harvest (cf. *Matt.* 13,24-30). The duty of repressing moral and religious error cannot therefore be an ultimate norm of action. It must be subordinate to higher and more general norms, which in some circumstances permit, and even perhaps seem to indicate as the better policy, toleration of error in order to promote a greater good.

Thus the two principles are clarified to which recourse must be had in concrete cases for the answer to the serious question concerning the attitude which the jurist, the statesman and the sovereign Catholic state are to adopt, in consideration of the community of nations, in regard to a formula of religious and moral toleration as described above. First: that which does not correspond to truth or to the norm of morality objectively has no right to exist, to spread or to be activated. Secondly: failure to impede this with civil laws and coercive measures can nevertheless be justified in the interests of a higher and more general good.

Before all else the Catholic statesman must judge if this condition is verified in the concrete—this is the “question of fact.” In his decision he will permit himself to be guided by weighing the dangerous consequences which stem from toleration, against those from which the community of nations will be spared if the formula of toleration be accepted; moreover, he will be guided by the good which according to a wise prognosis can be derived from toleration for the international community as such, and indirectly for the member state. In that which concerns religion and morality he will also ask for the judgment of the Church. For her, only He to whom Christ has entrusted the guidance of His whole Church is competent to speak in the last instance on such vital questions which touch international life, that is, the Roman Pontiff.

VI

The institution of a community of nations, which today has been partly realized but which is striving to be established and consolidated upon a higher and more perfect level, is an ascent from the lower to the higher. that is, from plurality of sovereign states to the greatest possible unity.

The Church of Christ has in virtue of a mandate from her Divine

Founder a similar universal mission. She must draw to herself and bind together in religious unity the men of all races and of all times. But here the process is in a certain sense the contrary: she descends from the higher to the lower. In the former case, the superior juridical unity of nations was and still is to be created. In the latter, the juridical community with its universal end, its constitution, its powers and those in whom these powers are invested are already established from the beginning by the will and decree of Christ Himself. The duty of this universal community from the outset is to incorporate all men and all races (cf. *Matt.* 28,19) and thereby to bring them to the full truth and the grace of Jesus Christ.

The Church in the fulfillment of this her mission has always been faced and is still faced in large measure by the same problems which the functioning of a community of sovereign states must overcome; only she feels them more acutely, for she is obligated to the purpose of her mission, determined by her Founder Himself, a purpose which penetrates to the very depths of the spirit and heart of man. In this state of affairs conflicts are inevitable, and history shows that there have always been conflicts, there still are and, according to the words of the Lord, there will be till the end of time. For the Church with her mission has been and is confronted with men and nations of marvelous culture, with others of almost incredible lack of civilization and with all possible intermediate degrees: diversity of extraction, of language, of philosophy, of religious belief, of national aspirations and characteristics; free peoples and enslaved peoples; peoples that have never belonged to the Church and peoples that have been separated from her communion. The Church must live among them and with them; she can never declare before anyone that she is "not interested." The mandate imposed upon her by her divine Founder renders it impossible for her to follow a policy of non-interference or *laissez faire*. She has the duty of teaching and educating in all the inflexibility of truth and goodness, and with this absolute obligation she must remain and work among men and nations who in mental outlook are completely different from each other.

Let Us return now, however, to the two propositions mentioned above: and in the first place to the one which denies unconditionally everything that is religiously false and morally wrong. With regard to this point there never has been and there is not now in the Church any vacillation or any compromise, either in theory or in practice.

Her deportment has not changed in the course of history, nor can it change, whenever or wherever, under the most diversified forms, she is confronted with the choice: either incense for idols or blood for Christ. The place where you are now present, Eternal Rome, with the remains of a greatness that was and the glorious memories of its martyrs, is the most eloquent witness to the answer of the Church. Incense was not burned before the idols, and Christian blood flowed and consecrated the ground. But the temples of the gods lie in the cold devastation of ruins howsoever majestic; while at the tombs of the martyrs the faithful of all nations and all tongues fervently repeat the ancient Creed of the Apostles.

With regard to the second proposition, that is to say, with regard to

tolerance in determined circumstances, with regard to toleration even in cases in which one could proceed to repression, the Church—out of regard for those who in good conscience (though erroneous, but invincibly so) are of a different opinion—has been led to act and has acted with that tolerance, after she became the State Church under Constantine the Great and the other Christian Emperors, always for higher and more cogent motives; so she acts today, and also in the future she will be faced with the same necessity. In such individual cases the attitude of the Church is determined by what is demanded for safeguarding and considering the "*bonum commune*," on the one hand, the common good of the Church and the State in individual states, and on the other, the common good of the universal Church, the reign of God over the whole world. In considering the "pro" and "con" for resolving the "question of fact," as well as what concerns the final and supreme judge in these matters, no other norms are valid for the Church except the norms which We have just indicated for the Catholic jurist and statesman.

VII

The ideas which We have set forth may be useful for the Catholic jurist and statesman also when in their studies or in the exercise of their profession they come in contact with the agreements (concordats, treaties, agreements, *modus vivendi*, etc.) which the Church (that is to say, for a long time now, the Apostolic See) has concluded and still continues with sovereign states. The concordats are for her an expression of the collaboration between the Church and State. In principle, that is, in theory, she cannot approve complete separation of the two powers. The concordats, therefore, must assure to the Church a stable condition in right and in fact in the State with which they are concluded, and must guarantee to her full independence in the fulfillment of her divine mission. It is possible that the Church and the State proclaim in the concordat their common religious conviction; but it may also happen that the concordats have, together with other purposes, that of forestalling disputes with regard to questions of principle and of removing from the very beginning possible matters of conflict. When the Church has set her signature to a concordat, it holds for everything contained therein. But, with the mutual acknowledgement of both high contracting parties, it may not hold in the same way for everything. It may signify an express approval, but it may also mean a simple tolerance, according to those two principles which are the norm for the co-existence of the Church and her faithful with the civil powers and with men of another belief.

This, beloved sons, is what We intended to treat of with you rather fully. For the rest, We are confident that the international community can banish every danger of war and establish the peace, and, as far as the Church is concerned, can guarantee to her freedom of action everywhere, so that she may be able to establish in the spirit and the heart, in the thoughts and the actions of men, the Kingdom of Him Who is the Redeemer, the Lawgiver, the Judge, the Lord of the world, Jesus Christ, Who rules as God over all things, blessed forever (*Rom. 9,5*).

While with Our paternal good wishes We follow your work for the greater good of nations and for the perfecting of international relations, from the fulness of Our heart We impart to you, as a pledge of the richest divine graces, the Apostolic Benediction.



Mediocrity and Progress

These are dangerous times. Creeping paganism and the menace of physical and ideological enemies require from everyone a painstaking vigilance. It is necessary to know who these enemies are, and what disguises they use, and what steps must be taken to outwit them. It is necessary to have a clear idea of what is required of a patriot and a Christian, and when the time comes, to stand and be counted.

It is not required that everyone sink into cautious mediocrity, that each step be taken in unison. There can be no advance if every action must meet the vague and general requirement that "everyone is doing it." And there will be no advance if each minute deviation from the usual is recorded and remembered—a handy tag to give power to anonymous critics. Freedom to grow means freedom to make mistakes. The consequences of mistakes are real enough without being inflated to serve private purposes. The enormous authority of social pressure is not to be taken lightly; it must take care to distinguish between the pioneer and the malefactor.—*TODAY, Chicago, Ill., December, 1953.*



UN Declaration of Human Rights

Although the U.N. Declaration is not all that the Church would like, it does embody a considerable amount of Catholic thinking. It has been attacked in some quarters because it does not actually mention God. But it does affirm "the inherent dignity and the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family," and these rights are of course God-given, whether this is explicitly stated or not. Thus to condemn it on this ground would seem to necessitate condemnation of the United States Constitution as well, for nowhere does the Constitution mention God either. But to say the least, American Catholics have found it a highly acceptable document for a good many generations.

In all, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights needs and deserves the staunch support of Catholics everywhere.—*THE UNION AND ECHO, Buffalo, N.Y., December 13, 1953.*

To the British Minister

POPE PIUS XII

Remarks of His Holiness as Sir Douglas F. Howard presented his credentials as Minister from Great Britain to the Holy See, January 18, 1954.

WE ARE deeply touched, Mr. Minister, by the warmth of feeling with which you have wished to convey to Us the kindly sentiments of your August Sovereign, the Queen, who has accredited Your Excellency to the Holy See as her Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary. Scarcely three years have passed since We had the happiness of receiving Her Majesty in these very halls; but in that brief time what heavy cares have entered into her life.

The Lord of all, in His wise providence, has placed the weight of empire on her youthful shoulders, and she has accepted the burden with a courageous simplicity and unselfish spirit of devotion that have at once won the admiration and affection of her peoples throughout the British Commonwealth of Nations.

We ask you to convey to Her Majesty the expression of Our esteem and the assurance of Our prayers that God, Who has blessed her with the sweet joys of a happy family life, may grant to her reign the precious blessings of prosperity and peace.

Peace—how easily the word comes to the lips of men today, while the substance of true peace continues to elude their grasp. The reason is not far to seek. The Prince of Peace, foretold by the prophets, came into the world; the memory of His birth is acclaimed each year by the Christian world; yet His teachings still so often fall on deaf ears.

Not only must sheer force give over its futile attempt to stifle in the human spirit its innate yearning for God; not only must the shackles of enslavement be struck from those God-given freedoms that are postulates of the dignity of man and human society, and are today denied to entire peoples; but if peace is to be secure, then justice and charity must inspire reciprocal confidence between nations and between the different classes within a nation, thus laying the foundations for a united effort towards the common, noble ideal.

It is gratifying to hear from you, Mr. Minister, the renewed expression of your country's devotion to those same lofty principles which We have had more than one occasion to proclaim to the world. That fact, together with the valuable experience which Your Excellency brings to the honorable task entrusted to you, gives every certitude for the success of your mission, and in carrying it out you may always rest assured of Our kind and unwavering support.

To the Polish Council of Ministers

CARDINAL WYSZYNSKI

This letter was addressed on September 24, 1953 by the Primate of Poland, two days before his arrest by the political police.

*Reprinted from the London TABLET**

IN CONNECTION with the trial, now concluded, of Bishop Czeslaw Kaczmarek, Ordinary of the Diocese of Kielce, the Polish Episcopate consider it an obligation of conscience to set forth the following explanation, which we submit to the Council of Ministers in accordance with the provisions of Article 32, paragraph 7, of the Constitution of the Polish People's Republic.

The allegation that the Apostolic See, the Holy Father and the Vatican issued political directives to the Polish Episcopate does not correspond with the truth. His Eminence the late Cardinal Primate A. Hlond, and also the late Cardinal Sapieha never transmitted to the Polish Bishops in the course of the work of the Episcopal Conferences any instructions of the Vatican concerning either the internal policy or the foreign policy of Poland. Nor has the present Chairman of the Episcopal Conference ever done so.

From the moment of assuming my appointment in 1948, I have never received either orally or in writing from the Apostolic See, the Holy Father or the Vatican any directives or suggestions on the lines of the indictment in the trial referred to. In the course of the sojourn of myself and Bishop M. Klepacz in Rome no attempt was made, even in the course of personal conversations with the Secretariat of State and during two audiences of the Holy Father, to pass on to political topics concerning the internal political relations of Poland, or her foreign policy. Not the slightest aspersion was made against the policy of the Polish Government. Not one critical word came from our high interlocutors about the persons who stand at the helm in Poland; their names were not even mentioned once.

I told the Polish Episcopate of this immediately after my return from Rome. What is more, I told President B. Bierut of it during a conversation on May 12, 1951. I repeated it many times to Vice-Marshall of the Sejm, Franciszek Mazur.

The assertion in the court proceedings and in the Prosecutor's speech concerning the allegedly political character of the Polish Episcopate Conference is tendentious, malicious and untrue. Internal political matters in Poland are not and never have been a subject of the Episcopal Conference. Reports in this field are never rendered, and never have been rendered, at the Conferences of the Episcopate. The Conference of the Episcopate never adopts resolutions and never gives Bishops directives concerning the internal and foreign policy of Poland. Never has any of the Bishops attempted to impose his own political views at the Conferences of the Episcopate. The

* 128 Sloane St., London S.W. 1, England, Nov. 7, 1953

sole topic of an ecclesiastical-political nature at the Conferences of the Episcopate was the Agreement concluded with the Government.

Other topics concerned the rights of the Church in Poland, questions of world-outlook and pastoral religious work.

The assertion in the court proceedings and in the Prosecutor's speech, alleging that sections of the clergy in the Bishops' Curias were a continuation of Catholic Action in disguise, does not accord with reality. Catholic Action was an organization of lay Catholics, who cooperated with the Church hierarchy. However, sections (*referats*) of the clergy in the Curias consist exclusively of priests, experts in pastoral religious questions, who give pastoral assistance to the clergy engaged in religious work in the parishes. This is not new work, for these *referats* existed already before the war in many curias, just as today they exist in some places. The work of these sections (*referats*) is governed by present-day opportunities and by the requirements of pastoral work, but not by those of political work.

The attempt made in the court proceedings and in the Prosecutor's speech to range the Episcopate on the side of the enemies of Poland is a wrong meriting the deepest regret. The Episcopate has made and continues to make an effort to establish a *modus vivendi* for the Church in People's Poland; the Mixed Commission and the Agreement are an expression of this attitude. Its outcome does not depend exclusively on the Episcopate, as appears from the memorandum of May 8 and from the further moves of the Government against the Church. The defence of the rights of the Church is not blindness, arrogance, or pride, an adventure and a conspiracy against the state and the people, as the Prosecutor declares of the Episcopate in his prosecuting speech, but is the highest and most sacred obligation of the Bishops.

The imputation against the Episcopate, that they acted to the detriment of Poland's position of possession in the Western Territories, is an injustice. All the efforts of Cardinal Hlond and the Episcopate were aimed at permanent organization and stabilization in the Western Territories. There is not one Polish Bishop who is hostile to the Polish *raison d'état* in the Western Territories. This injustice, which attempts were made to inflict on the Episcopate during the trial, we reject most decisively, believing that inexorable historical truth will show correctly the services of the Polish Episcopate to the Western Territories.

We consider that the attempt to arraign before the Court Tribunal deceased Cardinals and other Bishops no longer living is a serious infringement of the right to respect of those who are no longer able to defend themselves. Such methods are hostile to the lofty traditions of Polish judicature.

We leave the Council of Ministers to judge of the attempts of the Prosecutor of the Polish People's Republic to cast doubt on the Polish feelings and the patriotism of the late Cardinal Hlond, a man who by his whole life became a symbol of Poland and represented a model of love for his Fatherland in his steadfast work in Silesia, in the Primatial See and abroad.

In the name of the Polish Episcopate,

S. CARDINAL WYSZYNSKI.

Bishop Nicholas Steno

POPE PIUS XII

*Address given by His Holiness on October 23, 1953 to a delegation of prominent men who had come from Denmark to re-entomb the remains of Bishop Nicholas Steno.**

WE BID you welcome, distinguished gentlemen, who give Us the pleasure of your visit on the occasion of the honors which are about to be shown to the mortal remains of the scientist and Catholic Bishop Nicholas Steno.

Niels Stensen, as he is called in his Danish home-land, is respected by the people of his country as one of their very greatest men. Indeed, so high is the recognition this noble gentleman has received that—in his own country and in the rest of the world, in the Cathedral of Science as well as in the Sanctuary of Religion and the Church—already in the seventeenth century he had reached the pinnacle of fame on which he still stands today.

All agree that Nicholas Steno was an outstanding man of science. His was a versatile genius—in mathematics, anatomy, geology and paleontology. He was an expert in the method of the exact sciences and employed this method with strictest objectivity. Leading scholars of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries do not hesitate to call him a man possessed of creative spirit, a powerful genius, the Father of Geology, and one of those men who were or still are in advance of their own times.

It is easy to understand a regret which is often expressed that Nicholas Steno died so young at only forty-eight years of age, and that he terminated his scientific career at thirty-seven. He devoted the last years of his life to the exclusive service of religion and the Church. Surely he did not do this from any interior necessity. We can conjecture that he could have combined the continuation of his scientific research with the fiery zeal of his faith, which inspired his conversion to the Catholic Church. He would not have been the only person to combine an unswerving faith in Christ and His Church with highest scientific thought and achievement.

His whole life bears witness to the fact that Reason and Faith do not at all exclude one another but that, very much to the contrary, when both are genuine they confirm each other.

All regard with honor the character and personality of Nicholas Steno. He was a widely travelled man and had acquaintances and friends throughout all of Europe—from Denmark through Holland and Germany to Italy; from the Medici Ferdinand II and Cosimo III to Christian Louis I of Mecklenburg-Schwerin; from Francesco Redi to Leibnitz. Succeeding generations have, as we noted before, ever more deeply and intensely studied Steno's life and his work.

* Translated from the original German by Bernard Scully, S.J.

All, even those who in religion are distant from him—indeed even very far distant—, have always been and are now unanimous in their respect for the integrity of his character, the purity of his intentions, the spotlessness of his life. If the road of his scientific career found a premature termination, we may admit, nonetheless, that this was only a necessary step in order to ascend to another, higher plane whence was increased the lofty, uplifting moral influence of the gentleman and Christian Nicholas Steno.

The search for philosophical truth and for God through his scientific investigations (which were for Steno merely paving-blocks and mile-stones on the road to his goal) led him into the Catholic Church and caused him to become a priest. He took to heart the parables of the Treasure and of the Pearl, for which a man sold all that he had, with a wisdom that not many can understand, but with a real heroism which is recognized by all. We bow down in humility before the veiled decrees of Divine Providence which led Nicholas Steno to such a rapid perfection in desiring to suffer for Christ and in serving His Church.

We shall accompany you in spirit to Florence for the solemn ceremony of exhuming the remains of this noble man and holy priest and for the reburial of his body in the precious Roman sarcophagus which the Italian Government has donated to the Basilica of San Lorenzo for this purpose.

For yourselves, distinguished gentlemen, we express the wish that Nicholas Steno's brilliant insight into scientific research and his unflinching determination may be yours in your dedication to your own professional duties. May something of the spiritual flame which completely illumined him and fired him show to you a true and ultimate meaning in your life and work. May God bring this wish to fruition.



THE CATHOLIC MIND

EDITOR: Robert C. Hartnett

EXECUTIVE EDITOR: Benjamin L. Masse

With the collaboration of the *AMERICA* staff

EDITORIAL OFFICE: 329 West 108th St., New York 25, N. Y.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Paul A. Reed

BUSINESS OFFICE: 70 East 45th St., New York 17, N. Y.